

SENATE—Friday, March 19, 1993

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. DORGAN].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: *Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalms 33:12.*

Eternal God, our Founding Fathers were not saints, they were sinners like all of us. But they took God seriously. In times of trouble they called upon Him in prayer. They were free in speech and writing to acknowledge their faith—their need of God. They attributed the wisdom which founded our Nation as coming from God, they depended on Him, trusted in Him, served Him.

Gracious God, our Father, may the faith of our fathers be ours at this critical time when so much being debated either threatens or secures the future. Give us faith to trust You, to pray to depend on You for guidance.

We pray in His name who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The acting PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

Kennedy Amendment No. 183, to ensure the fiscal year 1998 funding levels of the Head Start Program are consistent with the levels requested by the President in his investment program.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 9:15 a.m. shall be divided, with 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] and 5 minutes under the con-

trol of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] with a vote on the Kennedy amendment No. 183 to occur at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will State his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as I understand it, amending a budget resolution is a restrictive process. Amendments must be germane, as I understand it, under section 305(b)(2) of the act and the precedents set.

I would ask the following questions: Does this amendment strike?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would advise the Senator that the amendment does not strike. It is an insert amendment that adds the language.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does this amendment change a number?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would advise the Senator that the amendment does not change a number.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does this amendment restrict some power in the resolution?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment on its face does not appear to.

Mr. DOMENICI. As I understand it, those are the four tests; am I right, Mr. President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would advise the Senator from New Mexico, those are generally the four tests.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Is this then a sense-of-the-Senate or sense-of-the-Congress?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that it is nonbinding language and it is the equivalent of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Then I assume, Mr. President, that if the Senator from New Mexico was to inquire as to whether this amendment was germane, the Chair would answer "yes"?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The practice in the past, the Chair would advise the Senator from New Mexico, is to allow these type of amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. Now, Mr. President, just on that point—and, clearly, I un-

derstand the issue and I do not want to use time on it, but it would seem to me we have now added another kind of germaneness to this and it is called "the equivalent of a sense-of-a-Senate."

Having said that, let me just make a few points.

First, to my good friend from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, no one needs to reaffirm, nor does he, his great support for this program and for programs like it. Frankly, in his career, this has been a part of what concerns him greatly, and I commend him for that.

Having said that, Mr. President, let me just lay a little bit of background for us on this.

The Head Start Program has enjoyed a 125-percent increase during the last 4 years. Republicans as well as Democrats have a strong record of supporting the program. It is funded at a level of \$2.6 billion for the current fiscal year. That is a 26 percent increase from the previous year.

President Clinton recommends what is called full funding for the Head Start Program, which would mean an additional increase over a baseline, which is already growing, of \$11.2 billion in budget authority and \$9.6 in outlays for an expansion of this program.

The President proposes \$500 million for the summer Head Start Program in his stimulus program and an additional \$2.7 billion in authority over baseline, growing at the rate of inflation starting point, for a 5-year growth in this summer program.

One might make the argument that, with an unexpended balance in excess of \$1.2 billion at the beginning of this fiscal year, we should perhaps question the ability of the program to effectively absorb funding increases of this magnitude. We might also want to consider the counsel of one of Head Start's original founders, who claims that only about 35 to 40 percent of the currently operating programs are of high quality.

We should perhaps look more closely at the draft HHS inspector general's report, which found that they need to strengthen the monitoring of grantees, and on and on.

My friend from Oklahoma, whose counsel I truly appreciate, is here. I understand he would like a couple of minutes to state his position and the position of for our side.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague, Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have three things printed in the RECORD. One is a table showing Federal spending on Head Start. It will show that we spent \$819 million in 1981. By 1990, that amount had just about doubled to \$1.255 billion. This year, 1993, we will spend \$2.78 billion. It has more than doubled again just in the last 4 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING ON HEAD START

(Dollar amount in millions)

Year	Amount	Change	Percent change
1981	\$819		
1982	912	\$93	11
1983	912	0	0
1984	996	84	9
1985	1,075	79	8
1986	1,040	-35	-3
1987	1,131	91	9
1988	1,206	75	7
1989	1,235	29	2
1990	1,552	317	26
1991	1,952	400	26
1992	2,202	250	13
1993	2,802	600	27

Mr. NICKLES. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles. One is from the Washington Post dated February 19. The headline reads: "As Politicians Expand Head Start, Experts Question Worth." And also an article that was in today's New York Times, "Head Start Is Criticized, Even by Its Friends."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1993]

AS POLITICIANS EXPAND HEAD START, EXPERTS QUESTION WORTH

(By Mary Jordan)

Extolled by Republicans and Democrats alike, Head Start is America's favorite program for preschoolers. But as President Clinton pledges to more than double to \$6 billion the funding for Head Start—essentially making it an entitlement for poor children—academics are increasingly questioning its claims and worth.

Others, including the founder of Head Start, warn that it may be expanded too fast and that one in three of the preschool centers is so poorly run it is a waste of money.

"Politicians always seem to be the last people to catch on to academic trends," said John Hood, author of a 1992 Cato Institute study that showed that new research is "raising doubts about the efficacy of Head Start." "Even boosters of the program grant that by itself it will not create huge benefits," he said.

Several recent studies dispute the long-held assertion that \$1 invested in Head Start saves many dollars later in health, education, even criminal justice bills. They contend that Head Start, a program born in the Great Society to provide schooling, food and health services to poor 3- and 4-year-olds, has immediate benefits, but that they often wear off as early as the second grade.

Edward Zigler, the Yale professor who founded Head Start during the Johnson ad-

ministration, believes the concept is still a good one but recommended against putting more money into it unless it is improved.

He cited a new report by the Health and Human Service Department inspector general that calls many of the programs poorly administered and unsuccessful in giving youngsters even basic care.

"If 30 percent closed down, there would be no great loss," Zigler said.

"Why put a lot of kids in a program that is no good?" he said. "Until the program has reached a certain minimum level of quality, they shouldn't put one more kid in it." He estimated that 35 to 40 percent of the Head Start centers are "high quality."

Because so many people desperately want to help poor children and Head Start has shown more promise than many other anti-poverty programs, it has been a popular political cause. But an increasing number of critics say the program was expanded fast without quality control.

The number of youngsters the programs serves has doubled in the past few years. It now serves 800,000 preschoolers.

Last year, then-President George Bush approved a \$600 million increase bringing the total annual cost to \$2.8 billion.

According to those familiar with the new inspector general report, some centers have been given so much money so fast that they cannot spend it. They have not been able to recruit enough new students and teachers. Also, because 47 percent of the teachers are paid only \$10,000 a year, it has been difficult to recruit a quality staff.

This week, Clinton pledged an additional \$514 million infusion to continue Head Start programs this summer. He also proposed adding another \$785 million next year and wants to double Head Start's budget to nearly \$6 billion by 1997.

"We all know that Head Start, a program that prepares children for school, is a success story," Clinton said during his televised address to Congress Wednesday night. "We all know that it saves money, but today it just reaches barely over a third of all the eligible children. Under this plan every eligible child will be able to get a head start."

"This is not just the right thing to do; it is the smart thing." However, Republicans like Rep. Bill Archer (R-Tex.) aren't so sure.

"There is clearly no definitive, conclusive study on the cost-benefit of the program over the long term," he said. "But there are some studies that show a high degree of fade-out" of the program's benefits if there is no follow-through.

Some studies have shown that Head Start raises a child's standardized test scores and increases the likelihood that the student will not be placed in expensive special education programs.

But even supporters agree that some of the program's benefits can disappear shortly after the program ends. They argue that Head Start is well worth its price tag but good follow-through programs are essential.

Common sense, Zigler said, tells people it is a good idea to give disadvantaged preschoolers vaccinations, food and phonics lessons. But, Zigler added, "any honest person is saying let's do this carefully and not throw our money away."

[From The New York Times, Mar. 19, 1993]

HEAD START IS CRITICIZED, EVEN BY ITS FRIENDS

(By Jason DeParle)

WASHINGTON, March 18—At the moment of its crowning political success, Head Start, the lavishly praised preschool program, is

suddenly being subjected to quibbles, criticisms and outright assaults.

President Clinton has extolled the program as an example of Government at its best and is asking Congress to increase financing by more than \$9 billion over the next five years, which could double the program's size by then.

But several Government and academic reports, some new and some newly emphasized, say the program suffers from considerable management problems and has not produced the results that some of its supporters have long claimed.

AN AWKWARD SITUATION

The debate has created an awkward situation for some Head Start advocates, who are celebrating the program as a grand success while acknowledging that it needs some patching up. Or, as Helen Blank, a lobbyist at the Children's Defense Fund, puts it, "The program is the greatest program ever, and it needs some strengthening."

Mr. Clinton has said that every dollar spend on the program will bring \$3 in future cost savings. But his arithmetic derives from a single study of a different preschool program, not Head Start.

Studies of Head Start have typically found that most of its academic benefits wear off after three years, with children who attend the program then performing no better than those who did not.

Supporters of the program contend that it also produces other benefits, like bringing improved health care to children and better social services to their families. But two unpublished Government reports suggest that these benefits may have been misreported and exaggerated, and they suggest that a larger Head Start program may have difficulty finding qualified teachers and adequate buildings.

In addition, the program has received some strong, if affectionate, criticism from one of its most eminent supporters, Edward Zigler, a psychologist at Yale University who helped found it.

In recent weeks, Mr. Zigler has repeatedly said that he thinks only about half the nation's 1,400 Head Start programs are of high quality, while about a quarter are "marginal" and the rest are so poorly run that they are doing virtually nothing to help the children.

Some of these problems have been quietly recognized for years. But they are now receiving new attention in a debate that is no longer simply about an effort to teach children their colors but a virtual referendum on the efficacy of Government programs.

Mr. Zigler's frank remarks are intended to bring more support to the program, in the form of higher teacher salaries and more intensive social services. But even if such improvements occur, Mr. Zigler has said, he thinks the program's benefits will continue to fade after several years unless significant improvements are made in the public school system.

Some Congressional conservatives have seized on the criticisms to oppose Mr. Clinton's proposal and paint the President as a spend-happy liberal who is wasting taxpayers' money.

THE CRITERIA CHANGE

Part of the confusion over the program's accomplishments stems from the fact that Head Start has been justified on different and shifting grounds.

Some supporters emphasize the program's immediate effect on a child's academic skills. Others say that while those benefits

wear off, the program produces important health benefits and social skills. And still others emphasize the effect the program has on parents both in encouraging them to be involved in their children's education and in offering them jobs as instructors.

The most recent round of conflict centers on two draft reports from the Inspector General at the Department of Health and Human Services. The reports, which have not been made public, question the extent to which the program is improving children's health or bringing new services to their families.

DISPUTE ON IMMUNIZATION

The report examined the files of 3,100 children in 80 different Head Start programs. While Head Start officials have contended that 88 percent of the enrolled children are fully immunized, the investigators said the records showed complete immunizations for only 43 percent of the children.

They said they were unsure whether the remaining children were missing their immunizations or whether the programs had simply not recorded them. The report also found that only 28 percent of the families enrolled received most or all of the social services they need.

A second report also questioned the ability of the system to accommodate a sudden large expansion, saying that 40 percent of the programs had recently experienced problems in hiring qualified staff, more than a quarter had been unable to enroll eligible children and a third had major problems in finding enough space for an expanded program.

Officials at the Department of Health and Human Services are disputing some of the findings. "It is our feeling that this overstates the problem," said Avis Lavelle, a department spokeswoman. She said the discrepancy in immunization rates was probably due to poor records, not missing services.

But she added, "Let me be very clear in saying this. We acknowledge that there are problems in terms of uneven quality in the delivery of services."

BIGGER AND BETTER BOTH?

Mr. Clinton has pledged to add \$1.8 billion next year to the \$2.8 billion currently being spent, but has not said how the money will be spent. This sets the stage for a fight between those most eager to expand the program's enrollment and those who want to improve its quality. "The discussions are really just beginning," said an Administration official involved in them.

Mr. NICKLES. I will just read a couple of paragraphs from these articles:

"Others, including the founder of Head Start—they are talking about Mr. Zigler—'warn it may be expanded too fast and that one in three of the preschool centers is so poorly run it is a waste of money.'"

It also cites "*** a Cato Institute study that showed that new research is 'raising doubts about the efficacy of Head Start.'"

I will read another quote, and this is by Mr. Zigler. It says: "Why put a lot of kids in a program that is no good?" He said, "Until the program has reached a certain minimum level of quality, they shouldn't put one more kid in it." He estimated that 35 to 40 percent of the Head Start centers are "high quality."

Mr. President, I am not an expert on this program. I have supported Head

Start in the past and I know of some programs in my State that are doing a good job and I compliment them for it. But I will conclude with this last sentence—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. NICKLES. Talking about Mr. Zigler, "Common sense, tells people it is a good idea to give disadvantaged preschoolers vaccinations, food and phonics lessons. But," Zigler added, "any honest person is saying let's do this carefully and not throw our money away."

Mr. Zigler is the founder of the Head Start Program. He is saying we should do a better job with the money we are spending before we throw away additional resources. I happen to think he is correct.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks time? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, it is so interesting to listen to my friends here on the floor talk about Mr. Zigler. He was the founder of the Head Start Program. He was the one, in 1969, when the Westinghouse study came in—which was a poor study, under a Republican administration, with Secretary Richardson—who was able to persuade the President to continue the program.

Then in 1980 he did another study, analyzing the Head Start Program, talking about its benefits and about its needs, talking about the importance of not just adding more children but the importance of quality of those programs and strengthening the parental involvement and talking about follow-through programs. The administration for 10 years ignored those recommendations.

Then in 1990 we have this study of the Head Start Program making a series of recommendations again, and the Bush administration abolished them.

The issue here is we have a good program and we have to make it better. We hear the opponents say: Look, what is happening to those children is we are not having the adequate followthrough. That is the problem with the schools, not the Head Start Program.

Mr. President, we had allocated in 1990, when George Bush signed that program, full funding. It passed here unanimously. President Bush supported that program. Now under President Clinton we say we want to do what President Bush signed on to do, and we will take 4 more years in doing it. And now the opposition party is saying no way.

Mr. President, it just does not make sense. We understand the importance of taking the Chapter 1 Program, which we will be reauthorizing this year, taking the recommendations of the other studies that have been made on this program to strengthen it, enhance it. But it comes with poor grace, Mr. President, from those who have refused to take the recommendations of Mr. Zigler on this, to distort and misrepresent his position.

I had the opportunity to talk with him 15 minutes ago and he said he deplored those individuals who were distorting and misrepresenting his position on this issue.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and I ask unanimous consent to have a number of letters and materials in support of the Head Start printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALE UNIVERSITY,

New Haven, CT, March 9, 1993.

Hon. EDWARD KENNEDY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: In view of your long history of commitment to and effective advocacy for our nation's Head Start program, I wanted to share with you the enclosed letter signed by 16 scholars and early childhood experts. As you will read, these experienced professionals enthusiastically support President Clinton's proposal to fully fund and strengthen Head Start.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on efforts to make quality Head Start services available to every child in need of them.

Cordially,

EDWARD ZIGLER,
Sterling Professor of Psychology.

MARCH 4, 1993.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: We the undersigned enthusiastically endorse President Clinton's proposal to strengthen and fully fund Head Start. We urge you to work to ensure that his proposal is approved by the Congress, sending a strong signal to the nation that our government recognizes the importance of investing in our children's development and potential.

Expanding Head Start is the best way to guarantee that all children enter school ready to learn. The program supports both young children and their families through a range of comprehensive services. Evidence from research clearly demonstrates that high quality comprehensive preschool programs yield substantial long-term benefits for low-income children, promoting their healthy development and future success.

We strongly support the Administration's commitment to make the resources available to strengthen the quality of Head Start, and are pleased to see their emphasis on this important issue. For too many years, Head Start programs have been pushed to expand enrollment without sufficient attention to improving quality.

Head Start has many excellent programs and some that need strengthening. The fact

that some Head Start programs need improvement cannot and should not be used as an excuse for delaying, whittling down, or opposing the President's effort. The proposed investments are urgently needed now, both to further strengthen Head Start's quality and to expand the program so that all eligible children can participate.

Therefore, we urge you to support President Clinton's full funding request for Head Start. Fulfilling the promise of full funding is long overdue, and is a necessary step in helping America's disadvantaged children get the foundation they need to be tomorrow's leaders, taxpayers, and productive citizens.

Sincerely,

Dr. J. Lawrence Aber, Associate Professor of Clinical and Developmental Psychology, Columbia University.

Dr. Ernest Boyer, President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Dr. T. Berry Brazelton, Professor of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University.

Dr. Robert Cooke, Chairman, Scientific Advisory Board, Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation and Chairman, Head Start Planning Committee.

Dr. Eugene Garcia, Dean of Social Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Dr. Edmund W. Gordon, John M. Musser Professor of Psychology Emeritus, Yale University.

Dr. Sharon Lynn Kagan, Senior Associate, Bush Center, Yale University.

Drs. Craig and Sharon Ramey, Directors, Civitan International Research Center and Professors, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Dr. Julius B. Richmond, Professor of Health Policy Emeritus, Department of Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Sandra Scarr, Commonwealth Professor of Psychology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Ms. Lisbeth Schorr, Director, Harvard University Project on Effective Services.

Dr. David Weikart, President, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Dr. Sheldon H. White, Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.

Dr. Katherine Taaffe Young, Assistant Director, Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children, Carnegie Corporation of New York (affiliation for identification purposes only).

Dr. Edward Zigler, Sterling Professor of Psychology, Yale University.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, March 11, 1993.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND CONFERENCE

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen; distinguished members of the Children's Defense Fund board; Secretary Reich and Secretary Riley—did you see the way Secretary Reich rushed out when they said the President of the United States? (Laughter.) That's not true; I pushed him through the door so I could get a laugh out of it. (Laughter.)

My dear friend, Marian Wright Edelman, as usual, your introduction has left me nothing to say. (Laughter.)

I will say this: I know a lot of people will come here and tell you how much they appreciate people who are children's advocates; not very many people appreciate it enough

to marry one—and I did. (Laughter and applause.) I also have savaged the ranks of the CDF board. My wife had to resign because she was married to a presidential candidate. And then Donna Shalala had to resign because I gave her a job. (Laughter.) Which on Sunday, she'd probably rather swap for being chair of the Children's Defense Fund board.

I am delighted to be here. I look out on this crowd and I see many old friends that—you know, a lot of people ask me what it's like to be President. And I don't know if I can explain it, but it is different. (Laughter.) And the other day—people either want to walk around on tippy-toe or take a baseball bat and whack your head off. There seems to be nothing in between. And the other day Hillary had a number of people into the White House on the first floor to some sort of meeting. And I got off on the floor and I had to go someplace else. And all of a sudden, all these people were there. And I walked out into this crowd and I started shaking their hands. And the guy who was with me said, "Oh, Mr. President, I'm so sorry that you had to deal with all those people." I said, "That's all right, I used to be one." (Laughter.)

I hope I will be again some day. (Laughter.) Meanwhile, I'm going to depend on you and the American people to keep me just as close to humanity as I possibly can.

I've just come from a remarkable event in Maryland with a number of members of the Congress who are friends of the Children's Defense Fund. We were there—Secretary Reich was there with me; we flew back. And we were at a plant that belongs to Westinghouse. It used to be a defense plant and it is increasingly becoming a domestic technology plant. And we went there to announce an economic conversion program to try to help more people who are losing their jobs from military cutbacks either in the private or the public sector find new opportunities moving toward the economy of the 21st century. (Applause.)

This is a very important thing. We've been reducing defense since 1985, and no nation would so reduce one sector of its economy that provided so many high-wage, high-growth jobs that was on the cutting edge of new technology. No other nation would ever have done what we've done with no clear strategy but what to do with all those resources, all those people, to try to help to build our economic base. So we will continue to reduce defense, as we must, but we're trying to plan for the future of those people and those incredible resources.

I saw military technology turn into an electric car that will drive over 80 miles an hour and which may hold the promise of ending our dependence on foreign oil and cleaning up our atmosphere. I saw a police car with a computer screen with visual imaging developed for defense technology, which can now be used immediately to transmit to police officers who have it pictures of missing children immediately while they're in their car. (Applause.) I saw a plane with radar technology which just came back from dealing with the difficult incident in Waco, Texas; and another plane—defense technology—another plane with a different sort of technology now which can be put on all of our commercial air flights to detect wind shears, which is one of the major causes of airline misfortunes now among commercial airlines.

I say all this because—everybody says, well, that's a great idea, and it's self-evident, and why haven't we been doing this. But it is simply reflective of a problem we have had

in this country for some time, which is that we have undervalued the importance of increasing the capacity of our people. We have talked a lot about a lot of things in America, but when you strip it all away and you look at where we have been sort of out of sync with many other countries and with where we have to go in the future, it is clear that on a broad range of areas, we have simply undervalued the importance of making a commitment to the idea that we don't have a person to waste, that everybody counts, and that what you can do affects not only your future but mine as well. (Applause.)

These, of course, are the arguments that the Children's Defense Fund has been making since its inception in its struggles to get a better deal for America's children. They have become far more important arguments in the last decade.

In 1985, a remarkable thing happened, a thing altogether laudatory in our country: our senior citizens became less poor than the rest of us—a thing we can be proud of. People used to have to live in absolute agony wondering what would happen to their parents. You still do if you have long-term care problems. But most elderly people now, because of Social Security and supplemental security income and Medicare, can look forward to a security—and because of the pension reforms of the last several years, can look forward to a security in their later years that 10 or 20 or 30 years ago was utterly unheard of. And it is really a testimony to the farsightedness of our country.

However, at the same time, in the same decade, we began to experience a new class of poor people who were dramatically undervalued. They were little children and their poor parents—usually their single poor parents. And they had no advocates in many councils of power. If it hadn't been for the Children's Defense Fund and a few others who walked with them through life, many of the good things which have been done would not have been done, and all the things which were done were not enough to reverse the trends of the 1980s when the elderly became less poor and the children became more poor.

Now, because many of you in this room have continued this fight, and because of the decisions the American people made in the last election, we once again have a chance to invest in the hopes and the dreams of our children. (Applause.)

I have asked the United States Congress to embrace a program that recognizes, as was said earlier, that we have two big deficits in this country. We have a huge budget deficit, but we also have a huge investment deficit. It was a cruel irony of the last 12 years that we not only took the government debt from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, with annual deficits now in excess of \$300 million projected for the next few years unless we change it, but we found a way in all of that to actually reduce our investment in our future at the national level.

How could it happen? Well, it happened because of a big military buildup, it happened because of a big tax cut early, it happened because health care costs have been completely out of control, it happened because an underperforming economy didn't produce many revenues. But it happened also because there were not enough people who said we must constantly invest in the most important thing in a modern society—the capacity of the people to be healthy and strong and good.

So you have all these anomalies. The United States, the world's strongest economy, has the third worst record in the Western

Hemisphere for immunizing its children against preventable childhood diseases. The United States, a country that has dominated the economy of the world for the last half a century, has higher rates of adult illiteracy and school dropout and dysfunction among adults than most of its major competitors, and the highest rate of incarceration of any country in the world—something we rank first in.

That bespeaks our inability to make the diversity of our country a source of strength instead of weakness, and to deal with the stark dilemmas of poverty in ways that at least give the children a chance to do better. Well, now we have a chance.

The good news is we know a lot about what works. We've known for years through clear studies that, though not perfect, Head Start and WIC and immunizations really do make a difference. We know that if you give children a better life and you strengthen their families, you make the economy stronger and you free up money to be spent on things like that economic conversion program I just visited today.

We know that if we focus on people and their capacities, it really does work. That's why I was really pleased that the first bill I signed was the Family and Medical Leave Act because it will, even to those who oppose it, make their businesses more productive, not less, by securing family life and making it possible for people to be good parents. (Applause.) That's why the long-term economic plan and the short-term economic stimulus I asked the Congress to embrace includes funds to put our people first for 700,000 summer jobs for young people; for the beginnings of summer Head Start programs where they don't exist; for beginning to set up the infrastructure of immunization where it isn't so that we can start to do the work that has to be done.

We have simply got to invest in our people in ways that work. Marian has already said it, but I will reiterate—this budget is funded by the Congress, will fully fund Head Start and WIC—(applause)—will create a network of immunization efforts which will permit us to finally immunize our little children against preventable childhood diseases. (Applause.) Something that will save, over the long run, ten bucks for every dollar we put into it. How do you explain—I mean, how can you possibly justify to anybody, that our country with the power of its economy, that produces the vast majority of vaccines produced anywhere in the world, is better only than Bolivia and Haiti in this hemisphere in immunizing our children?

And you know, you have to have a certain core of immunization to make sure that there will be no outbreak of diseases. We are dangerously, perilously close to falling below that core of immunized children in many different areas. This is a big deal, folks.

So I hope that we will have this attitude now, that we ought to invest as we cut the deficit. The plan that I presented to the Congress reduces the deficit dramatically, has 150 specific budget cuts, starts with an example from the White House staff. We cut the staff in the next fiscal year 25 percent below the staffing levels that I found when I came. We cut \$9 billion out of the administrative costs of federal agencies. And I mean they're real cuts; they're going into the budget. They cannot be escaped. (Applause.)

I'm glad you're clapping for that, you know, because the people that are attacking me act like anybody that wants any money from the government just loves all that bureaucracy you have to put up with. I know better. (Laughter and applause.)

We also raised some tax money. I saw the proof of an article by David Stockman coming out in a magazine soon which talked about how the clear problem is that the tax base of this country was dramatically, fundamentally and permanently eroded in 1981; that Social Security's about the same percentage of gross national product today as it was back in 1981.

So we have to raise some more money if we want to reduce the debt. But we also try to reverse the investment gap in things that you didn't come here to talk about, like transportation and clean water and better sewage systems, and things that will strengthen the environment and put people to work and increase our productivity. (Applause.) And things like community development operations to add jobs to high unemployment areas; in national service, which Marian mentioned, and in other areas that will increase the capacity of people to work, to grow, to learn, to flourish.

Now, there are people, believe it or not, who, number one, don't want to pass a stimulus package at all because they say the economy's great. That's because most people in Washington are employed. Talk to them about that, will you. (Laughter.) And who think that this program would be even better if it didn't have any new investment at all.

Now, to be fair to those people, there are basically three lines of attack—you're going to the Hill; I want you to know I need your help. I need your help because there are a lot of people without jobs, there are a lot of people without adequate jobs. Most of the new jobs created in this last round—365,000 last month—hallelujah, that's great. But more than half of them were part-time jobs that don't have health care benefits for the kids and the families. (Applause.)

You need to know what they are saying—the people against whom you must argue. They will say, number one, we can cut the deficit even more if we just didn't have any investment. Or if we didn't take—pass any of the President's spending programs, we could cut the deficit as much and raise taxes less.

The problem with that argument is those people think there is absolutely no difference between putting another child in Head Start and keeping somebody working in an agency when the job is no longer needed and can be phased out, in supporting a regulatory apparatus that has long since lost its justification, in funding a pork barrel project that can't possibly be justified. In other words, these people think anything the government spends is equally bad. Educating a kid to go to college is the same as continuing the subsidy for sheep or any other program. No difference. Government spending is government spending is government spending. There is no difference.

Now, do you believe that in your own lives? Q. Noooo.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I mean, in your lives. If you take home a check every month, is it the same whether you spend it on making a house payment, making a car payment, saving money for your child's education, or just paying for an extra helping at dinner? Of course not. There are distinctions in the relative impact of how you spend your pay, how your business invests its money, and how your government invests your money. And so when people tell you there's no difference, tell them that's wrong. (Applause.)

And then there is a crowd that says, well, these programs don't really make any difference; Head Start doesn't work and there's no proof Head Start works. Now, this is an

interesting argument. (Laughter.) These people say—most of those who think there's no proof Head Start works still believes trickle-down economics did. (Applause.)

Until I proposed phasing in the full funding of this program, many of those who themselves objected had previously voted to expand it. To be fair, President Bush praised Head Start at every turn. A few years ago, Senator Dole introduced his own legislation to expand it. Sure, there are serious criticisms rooted in the fact that this is not a new program. There are people who say it's not evenly good across the country. That is true. There are people who say it could be managed better. That's true. There are people who say that cognitive improvements don't always last more than two years after children stop attending, depending on where they are. That's true.

One big deal is how strong the parents' involvement really is. There are those who say—(applause)—there ought to be more school-based programs or more home-based programs, and we've worked hard on that at home. All that's true. That is not an excuse not to fully fund Head Start. (Applause.)

Our programs will serve more children, but it will also strengthen the quality of Head Start and put some flexibility back into the program so that it can meet the needs of the different communities that are served. But those who choose to ignore the overwhelming evidence of the program's success have an obligation to tell us why more children with high self-esteem and better grades and better thinking skills and better predictable long-term performance is such a bad idea. I think it's a great idea. (Applause.)

But we must, in fairness to the criticisms, become our own most severe critics. That's where you come in, because all of you live out there where these programs work. You could give a better criticism of what's wrong with most of these public programs than those who don't want to find them. Most of you could. So tell them you know it is up to us to be our own most severe critics.

I just asked the Vice President to review every program in the government; come back to me in six months with all kinds of other things that we can stop doing or that we can modify, or that we can push back to people at the grassroots level. If we who believe in government don't have the courage to change it, we cannot expect those who don't to help us in our efforts. (Applause.)

And this is just the beginning. Just two days ago I asked Secretary Shalala to draft a new child welfare initiative to combine family support and family preservation services—(applause)—to do more to build on the work of Senator Rockefeller and Congressmen Matsui and Congresswoman Schroeder; and to do more for families at risk, especially those at risk of foster care placement, even as we try to strengthen our efforts to enforce child support enforcement for those who have been abandoned by one parent. (Applause.)

Now, there is a third argument against this effort. There are those who say, yes, Head Start's a good deal; WIC is a good deal. The immunization's a good deal; and yes, we ought to invest as opposed to consume. There is a distinction to be drawn in the way this money is spent and investment is better—investment in our children, our future. But we still ought not to do it because we need even more deficit reduction.

And let me say, that is an argument you must treat with respect. We have gone from a \$1-trillion deficit to a \$4-trillion deficit in 12 years. We have imposed a crushing burden

on the present, and a bigger one on the future. And if you think about it, it's really an income transfer. Now that we're spending 15 cents of every dollar you pay the government—most of you are middle class people—and we spend 15 cents of every dollar you pay the government paying interest on the debt. Those bonds are largely held by upper income people. So there are now a lot of liberals in the Congress who are rethinking their old positions on things like the mechanisms by which we move to balance the budget on the theory that we're spending all this money having an income transfer from middle-class taxpayers, lower-income taxpayers, to people who hold the bonds because we didn't have the discipline to run our budgets better.

And if we don't do something about the deficit—we just keep on spending like we are—by the end of the decade, your annual debt will be \$653 billion a year. The interest service will be about 22 cents of your tax dollar. Twenty cents on the dollar of every dollar in America, public and private, will go to health care. So we have to change.

But my answer to those who say, well, let's just don't invest because this deficit is such a big problem, is, number one, we got into this mess over 12 years, and we have more than four years to get out of it. (Applause.) Number two, we are reaping the benefits of the clear and disciplined and determined effort that the congressional leadership has now agreed to make with me to bring the deficit down. We have interest rates at very, very low rates. We have the stock market back up.

People say, hey, this thing is going to work. All of you can now look at whether you should refinance your home or your car. Businesses should refinance their debt. If we get all this debt refinanced in the next year, that will add \$80 to \$100 billion back in our economy. We are reaping the benefits of a disciplined program to reduce the deficit today. But if we do not also at the same time recognize that for 12 years we have ignored our obligations to invest in our jobs, in our people, in our education, if we don't do that we will pay for that neglect tomorrow, just like we're paying for yesterday's neglect today. We can do both things. (Applause.)

There's another argument you need to make—and I'm speaking for my wife now, as well as for me—which is that if you just cut out all these programs that we believe in, if you just cut them plumb out, you'll still have an increase in the deficit again, starting in about five years, because of the explosion in health care costs. The real, ultimate answer to the deficit problem is to bring health care cost in line with inflation and provide a decent system of health care for all Americans. (Applause.)

And we can do that. So, with discipline, with a willingness to both cut and tax, with a willingness to reduce consumption expenditures and increase investment in our future, we can do the things that we have to do. But we can't walk away from any of our challenges and expect the results America needs. If we walk away from the health care challenge, it doesn't matter what they do on all these other cuts, you'll be swallowed up in debt five or six years again—if we walk away from the health care challenge.

If we walk away from the challenge to raise some more revenues and cut the spending we must, we'll lose control of our economic destiny even if we spend more money on the programs you want. You'll be raising and educating healthier, more well-educated kids to a weaker economy.

But if we reduce the deficit and we forget about the fact that in the world we live in, the only thing that really counts is people, every factory can be moved overseas. Three trillion dollars in money crosses national lines every day. Everything is mobile except us; we're here, we don't want to move. (Laughter.) All we've got's each other now in America. (Applause.)

That's what we've got. And if we ignore that, we don't think those little kids that live in the Mississippi Delta, in my home state, many of whom never see a dentist the whole time of their childhood, need a better shot in life because of us as well as them; if we don't believe that those kids that are sitting out there in the barrios in Los Angeles, in the black community, in the Hispanic community, in the Asian-American community, waiting for the resolution of the Rodney King trial only because it stands for everything else that ever happened to them—(applause)—not because of the trial but because of what it stands for—if we don't think that we need to prove that a county like Los Angeles County with people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups can live together and learn together and grow together and if they play by the rules can have the right to earn a decent living, and we don't think that effects the rest of us, we haven't learned very much in the last 12 years. (Applause.)

And so I ask you to do this: I ask you to go to the Congress and ask them to support this program. And go with respect, because I promise you most of these people are trying to come to grips with the dilemmas of this time. And they have gotten one big message; that is that we made a horrible mistake to let the deficit get out of hand like we did in the last 12 years. And they deserve respect for getting that message. And they now have a President who will take the lead and face some of the heat for the unpopularity of the decisions which have to be made. Go with respect for that. Say you had to do that and we respect that. (Applause.)

But remind them that out in the country where you live, bringing down the deficit is important if it gives people jobs and raises people's incomes, and if there are people out there who can seize the opportunities of the future. And what you represent is the future. You represent the needs of the people who will not be able to perform even with a sensible economic policy unless we do better in health care, in education, and in dealing with the needs of our poorest children. That is what you represent. None of this other stuff will amount to a hill of beans unless we put the American people first in all of these decisions.

That is the message I plead with you to bring to the Congress. (Applause.) Thank you, and God bless you all.

REPORTS ADVOCATING DEMOCRATIC SCHEME OF FULL FUNDING FOR HEAD START

(After 28 Years, Head Start Is Still Rich With Promises—Short On Funding)

"From all perspectives, Head Start works. The problem is that today, a quarter century after Head Start was authorized by Congress, two-thirds of those eligible still are not being served. Over the years literally millions and millions of young children have been ignored. This is inexcusable. How can America continue to justify denying children access to a program that will help them succeed in school and in life, and that will benefit the nation in the long run? It is as unethical as withholding a vaccine that would protect children from a dreaded disease.

"We propose giving all children the right to such a service—with full funding by 1995.

This is one peace dividend that would pay off handsomely in the long run."—"Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation (1992)," the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Dr. Ernest Boyer, President.

"Children who have not received the care and developmental stimulation that provide a foundation for learning are often at serious risk of experiencing a succession of failures in school. These early experiences of failure can lead to detachment from the educational process and later school drop out. Moreover, the presence in a classroom of even a few children who are unprepared for school can disrupt the class, distract other students, and lessen the teacher's effectiveness, thereby undermining the entire class's educational process.

"The National Commission on Children recommends that all children, from the prenatal period through the first years of life, receive the care and support they need to enter school ready to learn. In particular, we urge that Head Start be available to every income-eligible child in the United States."—"Beyond Rhetoric: A New Agenda for Children and Families," National Commission on Children (1991).

"CED continues to support full funding of Head Start to increase enrollment of all eligible three-to-five-year-olds, and we urge Congress to follow through with the appropriations that will match the full-funding authorization targets by 1994. We also believe that it is equally important that Congress promote the effectiveness of Head Start by ensuring adequate funds for maintaining the quality of services in both new and existing programs.

"We believe that it is more important than ever to act on the knowledge that our children are our future. If we fail to nurture and educate all our children, we will be closing the doors of opportunity to a growing number of young people and excluding them from participation in the mainstream of American life. The cost of failure is enormous, for what is at stake is the survival of our free-enterprise economy, our democratic system, and the American dream itself."—"The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education," Committee for Economic Development (1991).

"In the last few years, various blue-ribbon panels of business and education leaders, governors, and others have for immediate steps to reverse troubling trends among young disadvantaged children. The concerns emerge from evidence indicating that millions of poor young children suffer from inadequate "building blocks" necessary to reach their full cognitive potential. Such disturbing trends pose serious barriers to ensuring a competent and competitive future workforce.

"The reports urge investments in cost-effective, preventive programs for disadvantaged young children as part of a broader "early intervention" strategy necessary for these children to become part of a strong workforce. In particular, these panels have focused on effective programs that serve only a small portion of the eligible children.

"While calling for bold deficit reduction measures, business leaders, governors, and others have urged Congress to target available resources on expanding key effective programs such as WIC and Head Start."—"Investing in Young Children," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (1991).

Other Reports calling for Universal Access to Head Start for eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children include but are not limited to:

Report of the National Task Force on School Readiness (1992)—chaired by Governor Bill Clinton;

"Leave No Child Behind"—Children's Defense Fund (1992);

"Alive and Well: A Research and Policy Review of Programs for Poor Young Children Children"—National Center for Children in Poverty (1991);

"Concern for Younger Generations"—AARP (1991);

"Head Start: The Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge—Silver Ribbon Panel (1990); National Governors Task Force Report on Children (1989);

"The Common Good: Social Welfare and the American Future"—Ford Foundation (1989);

"To Secure Our Future: The Federal Role in Education"—National Center on Education and the Economy (1989);

"Reclaiming the American Dream: Fiscal Policies for a Competitive Nation"—Council on Competitiveness (1988).

THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY SPEAKS

"The first of the national education goals emphasizes that all children should start school ready to learn. One could argue that this is the most important goal of all because it is the beginning of life, a critical period, that sets the stage for virtually all of an individual's later achievement.

"We must, at a minimum, continue the commitment made last year to fully fund the Head Start program of all eligible 3-5 year olds. To fully fund an enriched Head Start program that could serve 3, 4, and 5 year olds, would be in the range of \$6 billion to \$7 billion, according to the best estimates available based on current population surveys."—William H. Kohlberg, President, National Alliance of Business.

"We need to make an even larger commitment for the future, the very near future. Head Start should be expanded so that every poor child who needs its comprehensive approach can benefit from it. Among the recommendations in our policy statement is full funding of all eligible three to five year olds by the end of 1994."—Mr. Frank Doyle, Senior Vice President, General Electric.

"We are pleased to see that the principle of early intervention to promote school readiness is now receiving the support it needs and deserves from the highest levels of our political leadership—President Bush and the nation's governors. We continue to support full funding of Head Start to increase enrollment of all eligible 3-5 year olds, and we urge Congress to follow through with the appropriations that will match full funding authorization targets by 1994."—James J. Renier, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Honeywell, Inc.

HEAD START: TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT

Every day, in thousands of communities across America, children come to Head Start to learn to work with other children, to receive a rich set of early experiences, and to learn about the world around them. Their parents are encouraged to play an active and central role in their early learning experiences.

Head Start helps children build the confidence and skills they need to succeed in school and to become the leaders, taxpayers, and productive citizens of the future. A Head Start experience for all eligible children is vital to achieving our nation's first education goal—that all children enter school ready to learn.

Head Start is a very special program. It recognizes that in order to thrive, young children must not only have a quality early education, but also must be healthy and well

nourished and have their parents actively involved in their learning. The program's multifaceted approach is essential to its success in helping low-income children and families:

Children who have a good preschool experience will be better prepared for school.

Children who are provided breakfast, and enough to eat during the rest of the day, will be better able to concentrate in school and generally more likely to thrive.

Children who are immunized and receive regular check-ups and health care will be healthier, which means they will miss less school and have more energy and heightened attention when they are in class. This can help improve their performance throughout their school careers.

Low-income parents who are struggling to support their children against overwhelming odds receive the help they need to become stronger partners in their children's learning experiences and to take steps toward self-sufficiency themselves.

Low-income communities can draw strength by helping themselves and running their own programs.

Head Start parents read to their children more, and show more interest in their children's reading and writing skills than similar non-Head Start parents. They also have their children help more around the house.

Head Start forges strong and innovative community partnerships. For example, two New Jersey Head Start centers, two federally-funded community health centers, and the Prudential Foundation have worked together to establish satellite clinics at each of the Head Start centers. Head Start children, their siblings younger than six, and other children in the community may receive physical exams, immunizations and certain primary health services in these satellite clinics.

Head Start provides jobs for Head Start parents and community residents. More than a third of its staff are parents of current or former Head Start children.

HEAD START CHILDREN

The children enrolled in Head Start come from a diverse group of families, almost all of whom are struggling to survive on extremely low incomes. Families must have incomes below the federal poverty line to be eligible for Head Start. In 1993, for example, a family of three would have to have a gross annual income of less than \$11,900 for their child(ren) to participate in Head Start. Up to ten percent of children may be from families with incomes above the poverty line.

Head Start primarily serves children between the ages of three and five, with the majority of the children being age four. Head Start's Parent and Child Centers and migrant programs provide services to families with infants and toddlers. Children with disabilities make up 13 percent of Head Start's enrollment.

RACE AND ETHNICITY OF CHILDREN IN HEAD START, 1992

Hispanic (23.0%)
Asian (3.0%)
Native American (4.0%)
White (33.0%)
Black (37.0%)

HEAD START'S SPECIAL DIMENSIONS

The Head Start program has changed and improved over time to better meet the needs of low-income children and families. Congress, policymakers, and communities have given the program the opportunity to grow, experiment and learn. The history of the Head Start model is one of adaptation, flexibility, and innovation.

Head Start has served as a national leader in the development and evaluation of innovative early childhood programs for disadvantaged children and their families. The quality and diversity of early childhood development services provided in Head Start has been improved through a wide array of special projects and activities.

Ensuring quality services: A recent national study of various child care and early childhood education settings, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, found that Head Start programs were more likely to meet national accreditation standards for good quality early childhood development programs and to have lower turnover rates than many other early childhood and child care settings. They were also more likely to provide comprehensive services and to involve parents in their children's learning. This quality is maintained by the Head Start Performance Standards which serve as a guide to programs and help them offer high quality services to disadvantaged children and their families.

Credentialing for Head Start Staff: The Child Development Associate (CDA) program, created by Head Start in 1972, helps to insure that a pool of trained staff are available to work with young children. The program provides important training and credentials for workers in Head Start and other child care programs so that they can offer better services to children and families.

Reaching isolated families: Home Start allows isolated families, particularly in rural areas, to receive Head Start's educational, health, and social services at home rather than at a center.

Meeting the needs of diverse children and families: Multicultural and bilingual efforts in Head Start help meet the diverse needs of families and children. Almost one-fourth of children in Head Start are from Hispanic families, and Native-American and Asian children are also represented. Among the recipients of the program are children whose primary language is not English as well as recent immigrants.

Serving children with disabilities: Resource Access Projects provide training materials to Head Start teachers working with children with disabilities, who by law must make up at least 10 percent of Head Start's national enrollment.

Nurturing families with infants and toddlers: Parent Child Centers serve families with young children from birth to age three. These centers help parents learn about the needs of their children and about the supportive services available in the community.

"Head Start has not only helped me directly in the center, but it has helped me outside. I've been able to grow. Being a part of the parent policy council has really enriched my life. Now, I am going to college and I'm seeking a higher education and a better way of life for my children. . . . We have a wonderful staff. We are like a family and we're always helping one another and enriching one another's life. . . . The STEP Program, the Parent Policy Council, the Center meetings, any way that you're involved with other members of Head Start, really helps you to grow . . . really enriches your life. And it's really enriched mine."—A Head Start Parent.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ARE COST-EFFECTIVE

The positive results of high quality comprehensive early childhood development programs have been documented by study after study and indicate both short- and long-term benefits, especially for children of low-income families. For example:

In the Perry Preschool Project, two groups of low-income three- and four-year olds were randomly selected for follow-up; one group attended the program while the other did not. A comparison of the two groups at age nineteen showed that those enrolled in the program were less likely to be school dropouts, dependent on welfare, or arrested for delinquent or criminal activity. On average, this program saved at least \$3.00 for every \$1.00 invested.

A similar study by the Institute for Developmental Studies at New York University School of Education tracked participants in an early childhood development program in Harlem. The 178 young people who participated in an extensive program similar to Head Start were found to have benefited significantly in their adult lives. They now are twice as likely to be employed as those who did not participate in such a program. Participants also are more likely to have graduated from high school and to have gone on to some form of post-secondary education.

While these studies were not of Head Start programs, they strongly demonstrate the effect that comprehensive quality programs can have on children's lives. The federal government has not conducted similar long-term studies of Head Start, though research has found that Head Start helps children do better in school and improves their health status. It is clear from all of these research efforts that good quality, comprehensive programs like Head Start can make a difference.

SUPPORT FOR HEAD START IS WIDESPREAD

Over the past 25 years, Head Start has enjoyed tremendous support throughout America. President Clinton pledged in his 1993 State of the Union Address to fully fund Head Start by eligible children still are not served by Head Start. Sufficient funds should be guaranteed so that by FY 1999, all eligible children are able to participate.

Ensuring that Head Start can adapt to meet families' needs

Head Start programs must also have the flexibility to meet the needs of the families they serve and offer them high quality, effective services. In order to accomplish these goals, an investment plan for Head Start must:

Offer full-day, full-year Head Start

Today, most Head Start programs operate on a part-day, part-year basis. This means that many low-income parents who are either working full-time, or are struggling to become self-sufficient and find a job, cannot use the program. Those Head Start programs that want to provide full-time care must put together complex funding packages with federal child care dollars to extend their hours. This makes it exceedingly difficult for Head Start to be able to respond to the needs of families in their communities. Head Start programs should be able to offer the choice of full-day, full-year services so that children do not have to be shifted between numerous caregivers in a single day, and so that children of low-income working parents can participate.

Make Head Start available during the summer months

The majority of Head Start programs close during the summer months. Low-income children typically do not have summer camp or other special programs awaiting them, and thus many are left to play on streets that are becoming increasingly dangerous. Others spend endless hours in vacant lots or empty and overheated apartments, in some

cases cared for by siblings as young as six or seven years old.

Allowing Head Start to remain open during the summer benefits children, their families, and low-income communities. Children will be better able to sustain the gains that they have made during the school year, and will have access to the many essential services (such as health care and nutritional meals) that Head Start provides. They will also have a safe and stimulating haven during the long summer. Furthermore, their parents will be able to continue to receive the important services they need—such as access to assistance in dealing with problems such as inadequate job skills or illiteracy or substance abuse.

Help families with infants and toddlers

Head Start serves primarily three- and four-year-olds, but is designed to allow local areas the flexibility to meet the needs of their communities. Research is clear that most effective programs for low-income children begin early in a child's life. Given the extraordinary stresses faced by today's poor families—such as substance abuse and homelessness—and the dearth of services available for families with very young children, it is more important than ever before that help be made available to families of infants and toddlers.

HEAD START'S QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Head Start is this nation's premier early childhood program. It builds on what we know works for children, catching health and developmental problems early and involving parents in their children's learning. Yet opponents of Head Start are seeking to delay, whittle down, or even defeat President Clinton's proposal to fully fund the program by raising concerns about the program's quality and effectiveness.

While a few critics of Head Start question the program's quality, there are many excellent Head Start programs around the country. A recent study by the U.S. Department of Education found that Head Start programs are much more likely than other early childhood programs to provide comprehensive services such as health care and nutritious meals, and to involve parents in their children's learning. It also found that Head Start programs are more likely to meet national accreditation standards for good quality early childhood programs than many other early childhood and child care programs.

As might be expected from a program that is serving more than 700,000 children through nearly 1,400 grantees, some Head Start programs need improvement. The weaknesses of these programs often can be traced directly to past federal policies which increased substantially the numbers of children participating in Head Start without adequate attention to quality. Responding to the concerns of the Head Start community, Congress took a series of important steps in 1990 to improve quality. The new Administration is committed to building upon these steps to make sure that Head Start meets its full potential.

We know that Head Start and programs like Head Start work for low-income children and their families. Research has found that children enrolled in Head Start are less likely to be in special education classes or retained in grade. Head Start also improves children's health and nutritional status, provides a strong source of support for their parents, and helps parents become more actively involved in their children's learning. While the federal government has not con-

ducted long-term studies of Head Start, studies of other high quality comprehensive early childhood programs repeatedly have shown that such programs can help low-income children do better in school and go on to lead more productive lives.

The fact that some Head Start programs need improvement cannot and should not be used as an excuse to oppose full funding for Head Start—in fact, the President's proposal is needed now precisely to strengthen program quality while also enabling all eligible children to participate.

HEAD START: THE NATION'S PRIDE, A NATION'S CHALLENGE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Head Start approaches its 25th anniversary with an impressive record of achievement and a new set of challenges. Over the years, Head Start has provided comprehensive services including health, education, parent involvement and social services to more than 11 million children and their families. The program has proven to be a sound investment in our nation's future and has received widespread support from parents, the general public, policymakers and the business community.

Since 1965, the importance of effective early childhood programs has grown and the demands on Head Start services have increased. During the past 25 years, the percentage of children living in poverty has escalated at an alarming rate. Today, American families are much more likely to have working mothers and to be headed by single parents. At the same time, problems such as substance abuse and homelessness pose serious threats to child development and family life.

Despite these new challenges, funding for this very successful program has fallen far short of meeting the needs of poor children and families. Inadequate funding is a serious barrier to protecting program quality, expanding enrollment and encouraging services that are more responsive to today's families. Furthermore, although new funding streams for early childhood programs have emerged, they do not come close to filling the gap for critically needed high quality comprehensive services or for establishing a cohesive early childhood system.

To meet these challenges and to build on Head Start's success, the Silver Ribbon Panel recommends that the federal government:

Invest in the quality of Head Start to ensure that the program provides effective comprehensive services to children and families.

We believe that ensuring the quality of Head Start should be the top priority. Immediate steps should be taken to increase staff compensation and training; expand the program's capacity to provide family support and developmentally appropriate practice; and improve facilities, transportation and program oversight. A portion of Head Start funding should be earmarked for such improvements.

Increase funding so that all eligible children who need Head Start can participate and local programs can provide services that meet the needs of today's families:

We believe that all eligible children in need of Head Start services should have access to high quality programs. Since we know that low-income children and families today have a variety of needs, our vision of Head Start includes expanded enrollment and service delivery that is more responsive to such diversity. This means providing addi-

tional program options, including full day, and allowing multiple years of service that may begin at a younger age.

Provide leadership to build a more coordinated and effective system of services for children and families through collaboration and research.

We see Head Start becoming a model of quality, a catalyst for change and a source of innovation within a network of services for young children and families. This vision calls for increased efforts to promote collaboration and research. Collaboration should focus on continuing the progress made in Head Start as children move on to public school, fostering linkages, between Head Start and other early childhood programs, building the supply of and access to other human services, and enlisting the support of the business community.

The panel endorses three broad principles regarding Head Start funding. First, it is a federal responsibility to ensure adequate resources for program improvement and expansion. This means making Head Start a priority in the national budget and providing federal leadership to encourage other public and private investments in the Head Start program.

Second, Head Start expenditures per child should be increased. Expenditures must be adequate enough to meet program quality and flexible enough to meet local needs. Third, Head Start expansion must be accompanied by the continuation, improvement and expansion of other early childhood and human services needed by low-income families.

We conclude by suggesting the establishment of a formal Head Start advisory committee to consider the recommendations set forth by the panel and advise on long range plans. We believe that such an ongoing group would help ensure that the spirit of this 25th anniversary will move Head Start successfully into the twenty-first century.

Actual Head Start Funding History: 1991, \$1.95 billion; 1992, \$2.2 billion; 1993, \$2.8 billion; 1994, 0.

1990 Head Start Reauthorization Funding Targets: 1991, \$2.38 billion; 1992, \$4.2 billion; 1993, \$5.9 billion; 1994, \$7.67 billion.

Clinton Head Start Full Funding Plan: 1994, \$4.15 billion; 1995, \$4.97 billion; 1996 \$5.81 billion; 1997 \$6.74 billion; 1998, \$7.67 billion.

Currently, Head Start funding is less than 50 percent of amount the Congress authorized for 1993 in the 1990 Reauthorization;

President Clinton has set us on a responsible course by laying out an investment strategy designed to achieve in 1998—what the Congress authorized for 1994;

PROJECT HEAD START STATISTICAL FACT SHEET

Head Start budget	Fiscal year 1992 actual	Fiscal year 1993 appropriation
Local Head Start projects:		
Projects in States and territories	\$1,967,107,000	\$2,497,788,000
Native American and migrant programs	153,755,000	185,308,000
Total	2,120,862,000	2,683,096,000
Support activities:		
Training and technical assistance/special projects for children with disabilities	47,076,000	58,588,000
Research, demonstration and evaluation	8,500,000	8,899,600
Monitoring/program review	5,402,000	5,702,000
Transition	20,000,000	20,000,000
Total	2,201,800,000	2,776,289,600

Note.—Number of grantees (fiscal year 1992), 1,370.

OTHER FACTS

The program is administered by the Administration for Children, Youth and Fam-

ilies (ACYF), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Grants are awarded by the DHHS Regional Offices and the ACYF Native American and Migrant Program Branches to local public agencies, private non-profit organizations and school systems for the purpose of operating Head Start programs at the community level.

During the 1991-1992 operating period Head Start programs report that:

13.4 percent of the Head Start enrollment consisted of children with disabilities (mental retardation, health impairments, visual handicaps, hearing impairments, emotional disturbance, speech and language impairments, orthopedic handicaps and learning disabilities).

82 percent of the Head Start teachers had degrees in early childhood education or had obtained the Child Development Associated (CDA) credential.

578 programs operated a home based program. Home based services were provided to 44,630 children by 4,396 home visitors.

33.8 percent of the staff were parents of current or former Head Start children. Over 606,000 parents volunteered in their local Head Start program.

94.7 percent of Head Start families needing social services received social services from Head Start and/or through referrals to other agencies.

68 percent of Head Start families have incomes of less than \$9,000 per year and 84 percent have yearly incomes of less than \$12,000.

Head Start programs are encouraged to use non-Head Start resources in their communities for Head Start children and their families. Recent data show that 63.1 percent of the Head Start children are enrolled in the Medicaid/Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program which pays for their medical and dental services.

Parent and Child Centers were initially launched in 1967 to provide comprehensive services to low income families with children up to three years of age. There are 106 Centers currently in operation around the country. The primary objectives of the Head Start Parent and Child Care Center program are the improvement of the overall developmental progress of the child, with emphasis on the prevention of a variety of developmental deficits, increasing parent's knowledge of their own children, enhancing parental skills, and strengthening the family unit.

Transition Projects—thirty-two community based organizations were awarded grants in 1991 to demonstrate effective strategies for supporting children and families as they make the transition from the Head Start program through kindergarten and the first three grades of public school. The organizations include Head Start grantees and public school systems. These projects are testing whether providing continuous comprehensive services to Head Start children will maintain and enhance the early benefits attained by the children and their families.

FISCAL YEAR 1992 STATE ALLOCATIONS

	Dollars	Enrollment
State:		
Alabama	40,020,653	13,012
Alaska	4,434,437	1,067
Arizona	20,728,637	6,179
Arkansas	22,296,763	8,213
California	219,422,605	52,658
Colorado	19,353,453	6,604
Connecticut	18,694,186	5,311
Delaware	4,454,359	1,333
District of Columbia	9,672,836	2,639
Florida	67,551,798	20,567
Georgia	52,224,673	16,080

FISCAL YEAR 1992 STATE ALLOCATIONS—Continued

	Dollars	Enrollment
Hawaii	7,546,861	1,974
Idaho	6,745,366	1,658
Illinois	99,851,613	28,802
Indiana	31,054,289	10,213
Iowa	16,484,282	5,266
Kansas	14,175,344	4,705
Kentucky	38,053,223	12,467
Louisiana	48,205,498	15,804
Maine	9,476,491	3,132
Maryland	27,042,600	7,594
Massachusetts	42,347,763	10,159
Michigan	82,320,773	26,174
Minnesota	24,372,946	7,136
Mississippi	71,861,334	22,343
Missouri	35,641,021	11,572
Montana	6,436,066	1,961
Nebraska	10,284,375	3,154
Nevada	4,004,263	1,073
New Hampshire	4,080,063	1,016
New Jersey	54,531,708	11,688
New Mexico	13,655,100	4,958
New York	153,857,920	34,688
North Carolina	44,258,298	14,083
North Dakota	4,284,464	1,458
Ohio	84,964,311	29,132
Oklahoma	24,077,616	8,977
Oregon	17,759,806	3,885
Pennsylvania	82,449,211	22,414
Puerto Rico	95,628,988	29,031
Rhode Island	6,964,242	2,293
South Carolina	27,716,497	9,025
South Dakota	5,421,037	1,691
Tennessee	39,270,696	12,481
Texas	113,611,730	36,394
Utah	10,668,599	3,403
Vermont	4,556,353	1,129
Virginia	33,134,302	9,455
Washington	27,533,158	6,361
West Virginia	18,959,237	5,842
Wisconsin	31,052,342	9,665
Wyoming	3,370,992	1,128
Outer Pacific	6,252,538	5,439
Virgin Islands	4,293,601	1,422
American Indian	65,914,802	17,559
Migrant Programs	87,839,902	27,211
Total	2,120,862,000	621,078

Enrollment:

Fiscal year 1992	621,078
Projected for fiscal year 1993	721,268

Ages (percent):

Number of 5-year-olds and older	7
Number of 4-year-olds	63
Number of 3-year-olds	27
Number under 3 years of age	3

Racial/ethnic composition (percent):

American Indian	4
Hispanic	23
Black	37
White	33
Asian	3

Number of classrooms:

Fiscal year 1992	31,254
Projected for fiscal year 1993	36,300

Average cost per child:

Fiscal year 1992	3,415
Projected for fiscal year 1993	3,720

Staff:

Paid staff: (fiscal year 1992) ...	109,345
Projected for fiscal year 1993	126,984
Volunteers: (Fiscal year 1992)	950,175
Projected for fiscal year 1993	1,105,454

PROJECT HEAD START

Fiscal year:	Enrollment	Congressional appropriation
1965 ¹	561,000	\$96,400,000
1966	733,000	198,900,000
1967	681,400	349,200,000
1968	693,900	316,200,000
1969	663,600	333,900,000
1970	477,400	325,700,000
1971	397,500	360,000,000
1972	379,000	376,300,000
1973	379,000	400,700,000
1974	352,800	403,900,000
1975	349,000	403,900,000
1976	349,000	441,000,000
1977	333,000	475,000,000

PROJECT HEAD START—Continued

	Enrollment	Congressional appropriation
1978	391,400	625,000,000
1979	387,500	680,000,000
1980	376,300	735,000,000
1981	387,300	818,700,000
1982	395,800	911,700,000
1983	414,950	912,000,000
1984	442,140	995,750,000
1985	452,080	1,075,059,000
1986	451,732	1,040,315,000
1987	446,523	1,130,542,000
1988	448,464	1,206,324,000
1989	450,970	1,235,000,000
1990	540,930	1,552,000,000
1991	583,471	1,951,800,000
1992	621,078	2,201,800,000
1993	721,268	2,776,289,600

¹ Summer only² Projected enrollment for fiscal year 1993.

Note.—A total of 13,140,000 children have been served by the program since it began in 1965.

TABLE B.—Fiscal year 1992 Head Start enrollment

Region I:		
Connecticut	5,311	
Maine	3,132	
Massachusetts	10,159	
New Hampshire	1,016	
Rhode Island	2,293	
Vermont	1,129	
Total	23,040	
Region II:		
New Jersey	11,688	
New York	34,688	
Puerto Rico	29,031	
Virgin Islands	1,422	
Total	76,829	
Region III:		
Delaware	1,333	
District of Columbia	2,639	
Maryland	7,594	
Pennsylvania	22,414	
Virginia	9,455	
West Virginia	5,842	
Total	49,277	
Region IV:		
Alabama	13,012	
Florida	20,567	
Georgia	16,080	
Kentucky	12,467	
Mississippi	22,343	
North Carolina	14,083	
South Carolina	9,025	
Tennessee	12,481	
Total	120,058	
Region V:		
Illinois	28,802	
Indiana	10,213	
Michigan	26,174	
Minnesota	7,136	
Ohio	29,132	
Wisconsin	9,665	
Total	111,122	
Region VI:		
Arkansas	8,213	
Louisiana	15,804	
New Mexico	4,958	
Oklahoma	8,977	
Texas	36,394	
Total	74,346	
Region VII:		
Iowa	5,266	

Kansas	4,705
Missouri	11,972
Nebraska	3,154
Total	25,097
Region VIII:	
Colorado	6,604
Montana	1,961
North Dakota	1,458
South Dakota	1,691
Utah	3,403
Wyoming	1,128
Total	16,245
Region IX:	
Arizona	6,179
California	52,658
Hawaii	1,974
Nevada	1,073
Outer Pacific	5,439
Total	67,323
Region X:	
Alaska	1,067
Idaho	1,658
Oregon	3,885
Washington	6,361
Total	12,971
Indians	17,559
Migrants	27,211
National total	621,078
Final State tables	
Fiscal year 1992:	
Connecticut	\$18,694,171
Maine	9,476,482
Massachusetts	42,347,733
New Hampshire	4,080,060
Rhode Island	6,964,235
Vermont	4,556,350
New Jersey	54,531,674
New York	153,857,818
Puerto Rico	95,628,902
Virgin Islands	4,293,597
Delaware	4,454,355
District of Columbia	9,672,828
Maryland	27,042,577
Pennsylvania	82,449,145
Virginia	33,134,274
West Virginia	18,959,220
Alabama	40,021,964
Florida	67,552,007
Georgia	52,222,062
Kentucky	38,053,187
Mississippi	71,861,269
North Carolina	44,259,257
South Carolina	27,716,471
Tennessee	39,270,659
Illinois	99,851,528
Indiana	31,054,260
Michigan	82,320,697
Minnesota	24,372,925
Ohio	84,964,226
Wisconsin	31,052,313
Arkansas	22,296,739
Louisiana	48,205,452
New Mexico	13,655,086
Oklahoma	24,077,589
Texas	113,610,274
Iowa	16,484,267
Kansas	14,175,330
Missouri	35,640,966
Nebraska	10,284,366
Colorado	19,356,537
Montana	6,436,060
North Dakota	4,282,718
South Dakota	5,421,032
Utah	10,670,343
Wyoming	3,370,989
Arizona	20,728,619

California	219,422,451
Hawaii	7,546,855
Nevada	4,000,259
Outer Pacific	6,252,522
Alaska	4,434,434
Idaho	6,745,361
Oregon	17,759,794
Washington	27,533,139
Fiscal year 1993 estimate:	
Connecticut	\$21,987,000
Maine	11,147,000
Massachusetts	49,606,000
New Hampshire	4,848,000
Rhode Island	8,187,000
Vermont	5,311,000
New Jersey	64,188,000
New York	181,234,000
Puerto Rico	112,579,000
Virgin Islands	5,058,000
Delaware	5,248,000
District of Columbia	11,398,000
Maryland	32,104,000
Pennsylvania	99,554,000
Virginia	39,442,000
West Virginia	22,228,000
Alabama	47,089,000
Florida	92,336,000
Georgia	66,051,000
Kentucky	45,097,000
Mississippi	83,507,000
North Carolina	54,041,000
South Carolina	32,952,000
Tennessee	47,967,000
Illinois	117,503,000
Indiana	37,803,000
Michigan	106,880,000
Minnesota	30,593,000
Ohio	109,942,000
Wisconsin	40,842,000
Arkansas	26,231,000
Louisiana	62,587,000
New Mexico	18,998,000
Oklahoma	32,148,000
Texas	171,557,000
Iowa	19,600,000
Kansas	17,755,000
Missouri	45,760,000
Nebraska	12,279,000
Colorado	25,566,000
Montana	8,172,000
North Dakota	5,542,000
South Dakota	6,445,000
Utah	12,985,000
Wyoming	4,152,000
Arizona	34,934,000
California	302,307,000
Hawaii	8,893,000
Nevada	6,389,000
Outer Pacific	7,345,000
Alaska	5,230,000
Idaho	8,030,000
Oregon	22,227,000
Washington	37,286,000

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would, by way of inquiry, ask my friend—perhaps on his time since I do not have any—where was Congress when all these suggested recommendations for change were made? Did they go to sleep? Congress could have done them, if they wanted to modernize the program. Why do we not modernize it?

Mr. President, I am not here to argue we should not fully fund Head Start. I do not know what level it ought to be funded at. But I doubt very seriously, and I say this to the Senate, that when it comes out of the appropriations process that it is going to be anywhere close to \$12 billion in new money for Head Start, because they are going to make some inquiries about it and they

are going to spend the money in here—because it is in here for everything, not just Head Start—they are going to spend it on some other programs.

If I were a betting man I would bet with pretty big odds the appropriators will not fund this to the amount that is to be recommended by the President.

This is not a difficult amendment. It should not be contentious. The Republicans have supported Head Start. For those who want to support this proposal this morning, I view their vote as one saying we support Head Start. I do not think you have to vote against it on this side at all. If you want to vote for it, it is saying we support Head Start. It is nothing more, nothing less.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico yields the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield that time to the Senator from Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in the time that remains, let me make the point that has just been made in a sense by the Senator from New Mexico. This is a program that has enjoyed tremendous bipartisan support over the years. The reason for the amendment is there will be a series of amendments offered calling for freezes across the board, no additional funding, maintaining levels of spending at last year's levels.

I think many of us who believe in reducing spending in certain areas, keeping it even with last year in other areas, and increasing it in certain areas, want to make the point here with this amendment that on this program, on Head Start, we believe more investments are necessary.

We fully understand it may be difficult to achieve the levels of full funding I would like to see or that my colleague from Massachusetts or others would like to see. But it is critically important that on this issue we make it clear—this is a program where we do not believe that spending ought to be maintained at last year's levels or rolled back. We ought to be investing more.

Ed Zigler is a good friend of mine—from Connecticut, of course. We have worked with him on so many programs over the years. Head Start does have some difficulties. The quality need to be improved. We understand that. If you are going to expand the program, as it should have been a decade ago, clearly you want to do more in the area of teachers' salaries, the quality of the program in terms of services available at these sites, how well equipped those sites are, and the like. So there is no question at all as you expand you want to maintain that quality or improve it.

But I suspect, frankly, that those who over the years have been dis-

appointed that Head Start had such support, at the first slight criticism about the program they want to jump on it and suggest we should not go forward and increase appropriations and spending for it.

Mr. President, this amendment, while it does not have the ability to appropriate funds, is an important statement. You cannot be for this and then vote for caps across the board. If you are for Head Start, this is the program you ought to be behind.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate a few points about the history of full funding for Head Start, as well as the program's quality. The concept of providing enough funds to give every eligible child the chance to participate in Head Start is by no means new to this body. In 1990, we authorized funding levels sufficient to do just that. Not one of my colleagues on either side of the aisle opposed that bill. In fact, because there was agreement on these provisions and therefore no need to debate, I had to request special floor time for statements just so this historic moment—so important to millions of poor children and their families—would not go unmarked. So, I say to my colleagues, that the concept embodied in this amendment before us today is something they have wholeheartedly endorsed before.

As I said, there are concerns about Head Start's quality. When I began looking at the program in preparation for the 1990 reauthorization, I realized it had been on starvation rations during the 1980's. The program was expanded with an appallingly low expenditure per child. Training funds for Head Start staff had been cut. Little technical assistance was offered to grantees, who are often vital antipoverty agencies struggling to provide good services to their very needy communities.

So, we addressed this need in the reauthorization legislation, creating a mechanism to ensure a steady stream of funds meant solely to improve quality. We gave Head Start quality an immediate shot in the arm—10 percent of the 1991 appropriation went to quality enhancement. Now, 25 cents of every new dollar that goes to Head Start must be spent on quality improvements: increasing staff salaries which often are at poverty levels, purchasing equipment, repairing buildings, training staff to deal with the difficult problems Head Start families face. We also have required Head Start teachers in every classroom to obtain credentials by 1994 and have increased funding specifically for training.

We are continuing to focus on quality, looking for ways to improve the Department of Health and Human Services' capacity to monitor programs and offer technical assistance. Most important, we now have an administration that takes seriously its mission to

administer the program and work with local programs to make Head Start even stronger. Overall, Head Start is a strong program, and we have the basic machinery in place to deal with its problems. Given that, I feel comfortable in moving to extend the program to the poor children and families of America who desperately need its services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Baucus	Durenberger	Mack
Bennett	Exon	Mathews
Biden	Feingold	McCain
Bingaman	Feinstein	McConnell
Bond	Ford	Metzenbaum
Boren	Glenn	Mitchell
Boxer	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Graham	Moynihan
Breaux	Gramm	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Nunn
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pell
Burns	Heflin	Pressler
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Campbell	Inouye	Reid
Chafee	Jeffords	Riegle
Coats	Johnston	Robb
Cochran	Kempthorne	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kennedy	Sasser
Conrad	Kerrey	Shelby
Coverdell	Kerry	Simon
Craig	Kohl	Simpson
D'Amato	Krueger	Specter
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeConcini	Leahy	Warner
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Domenici	Lieberman	Wofford

NAYS—12

Danforth	Hatch	Packwood
Dole	Helms	Roth
Faircloth	Kassebaum	Smith
Gregg	Nickles	Wallop

NOT VOTING—4

Lott	Rockefeller
Mikulski	Stevens

So the amendment (No. 183) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SASSER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last night we voted on the Nickles-Shelby amendment eliminating the Btu tax. We had an opportunity to save jobs, to keep our U.S. businesses competitive, and to help the United States.

Consumers, especially middle- and lower-income families—rural families from facing another tax bill.

FARMING

We had an opportunity to help keep our farms from going broke. Farming is a tough business.

Farmers must face the unpredictability of mother nature, the uncertainty and instability of foreign markets and Government redtape.

The Btu tax will add to those difficulties.

For an average 430-acre corn farm, the direct costs from the Btu tax for farm fuel use and fuel used to dry grain, amounts to \$800 per year.

For a typical Kansas farm with 700 acres of wheat and 300 acres of milo, the direct fuel costs alone would range from \$900 to \$1,300 per year.

In western Nebraska, a 2,700-acre Summer-Fallow wheat farm would pay an additional \$1,000 in direct fuel taxes.

These are very conservative estimates that do not include the added cost for irrigation, fuel-intensive inputs such as fertilizer, and home heating. If you add those costs, the estimates would easily double.

Not only does the farmer take a double hit in both added fuel costs and input costs, he also gets hit at the grain elevator when he sells his crop.

For those producers isolated from either a river terminal or export terminal—such as in western Kansas—prices received are discounted to reflect the cost of transporting that grain to its ultimate destination. Increased transportation costs from the Btu tax will be passed on to that farmer, resulting in lower farmgate prices.

But what makes this tax especially unbearable is that farmers cannot simply pass these costs on to someone else. Farmers are price-takers—all of the costs of this misguided tax proposal will be passed on to them in the form of higher input costs and lower commodity prices.

NOT JUST FARMERS

But it is not just farmers, it is everyone.

Kansas City Power & Light estimates that in Kansas, the President's Btu tax proposal will cost over \$51 million.

That translates to rate increases of approximately 5.9 percent for residential customers, 6.44 percent for stores, shopping centers, office buildings, and 9.4 percent for manufacturing concerns.

A higher tax could force many small trucking companies into bankruptcy. By raising the cost of transportation this raises the costs of goods.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that at a minimum, one-third of the total Btu tax will fall directly on manufacturing firms. According to their estimates, we stand to lose over 600,000 jobs.

Our economy cannot afford job losses.

DO NOT KNOW THE DETAILS

Mr. President, I have focused on the effects of the Btu tax as we know them today. Tomorrow the cost to farmers, businesses, consumers could be double, triple, or worse.

In reality, we do not know exactly how this tax works. We do not know where the tax is imposed—on oil for example, does the producer pay the tax? Does the refiner pay before or after the refining process? Is it assessed at the refinery rack? Do the wholesalers or retailers pay the tax? Or is it the consumers who pay? Ultimately it will be the consumers who pay higher prices.

We do not know what fuels are exempt. There are meritorious cases for exemptions—farmers, home heating oil, the list goes on, and once we start the exemption route what will that do to the gasoline tax? Anything not exempt will get a higher tax.

We understand that the administration is still trying to make it work. They may never figure it out and then we are stuck with raising some \$73 billion.

From where? From taxpayers.

I commend Senators NICKLES and SHELBY for offering this important amendment and look forward to eliminating the tax during reconciliation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is to be recognized.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, before moving into the discussion and debate on the Grassley amendment, I entered into a discussion earlier this morning with the minority staff director of the Budget Committee, and I am confident he has advised the distinguished ranking member of our problem. We have a number of Senators who could be accommodated in catching airplanes, if we could move the vote that is scheduled now for 11:35 back 10 minutes to 11:25. I ask my friend from New Mexico, if he has any objection to that taking place? I suggest that we simply shave 5 minutes off either side. Apparently, because of an airline schedule, a number of Senators on our side would be accommodated, and I suspect some on your side would be also.

Mr. DOMENICI. Why do we not start the debate, and I will talk a little bit on my side and get back to him, perhaps in the middle of the debate, and give an answer. I lean toward trying to do it, because I understand the scheduling problem, but I have to talk to the leader.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

(Purpose: To freeze nondefense discretionary spending across the board for five years)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], for himself, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 184.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$800,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$500,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$300,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$800,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$2,200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$100,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$300,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$200,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$500,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$600,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$500,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$800,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$700,000,000.

[illegible]

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$100,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$600,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$600,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$4,900,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$4,900,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$103,900,000,000.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time that I may consume, but I would appreciate it if the person keeping time would let me know when 15 minutes have elapsed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The chair will do that.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, several of my colleagues want time to speak. The cosponsors of my amendment are Senators NICKLES, BOND, BURNS, D'AMATO, COVERDELL, and HATCH. Senator D'AMATO has asked for 10 minutes, and other people want some time to speak for the amendment. I am not going to yield to anybody who wants to speak against it for time off my side. I urge particular members of the Budget Committee to participate in this debate, because this is a very important part of the sound process of people on this side of the aisle, as well as a few on the other side

of the aisle, I hope, to get this budget deficit down and under control.

First of all, I remind people on the other side of the aisle that you are in kind of a similar position as I was during the Reagan administration when I made a successful effort in the 1985 budget season to cut defense, freeze defense. We adopted that on a 50 to 49 vote. That vote led to the plateauing of Defense expenditures for the next 5 years. And it cut out all the new money that had been in the Reagan budgets for 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985. And it finally put us into a position where, starting in 1990, we could build down defense.

I think on that particular amendment, there were 12 Republicans and 38 Democrats who voted in a bipartisan fashion to freeze the Reagan defense budget. We did it because it was an irresponsible buildup. We needed to spend more money on defense than was being spent in the Carter years. In fact, in the last years of the Carter's administration, they had decided to spend more on defense. They saw the necessity of it. It was just a case of Republicans throwing money at the defense budget.

I fear that we have a new President now, and his party and power in the Congress are going to be throwing money irresponsibly at domestic programs, maybe not quite to the extent that Reagan did in regard to defense, but still irresponsibly so, considering the fact—that we have a \$350 billion deficit.

So I am asking people on the other side of the aisle to be willing to be Members of a Congress as an independent branch of the Government that has a constitutional responsibility.

Mr. President, I hope that the Democrats will see themselves in pretty much the same vein, same position as some Republicans saw themselves in under the Reagan administration, and that they will see that the financial situation is even worse now, because we have a \$350 billion deficit, and that we have to do more than was ever even done during the 1980's to keep expenditures down.

So I am offering this across-the-board freeze in budget authority for nondefense discretionary savings. This amendment assumes the fiscal year 1993 budget authority totals for each function, for each of the next 5 years. Let me say to my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, because this decision was made in the other body just last night on the budget they adopted. They adopted as part of their budget the same 5-year across-the-board freeze of nondefense discretionary expenditures as this amendment has. I suggest that that ought to be pretty significant to the people of the other side of the aisle in this body, when they vote on this amendment. It seems to me like if it is OK for the

Democrats in the other body, it ought to find a lot of friends on the other side of the aisle in this body.

This amendment would create \$104 billion in savings, thereby reducing the debt by that same amount. We do not spend it someplace else. You are not having this Iowa farmer taking some of the money and spending it on the entitlement subsidies for agriculture. We are going to save this money the same way as when we adopted the amendment to freeze the Reagan defense budget in May 1985.

This amendment would also, though, express a sense of the committee and a sense-of-the-Senate that low-income programs in the nondefense discretionary should be held harmless for inflation, so that people who are clients of these programs, who are below the poverty guidelines and cannot afford to absorb inflation, will be held harmless.

Now, of course, the justification for this freeze is simply the size of the debt and the growing size of the debt. As you see, this red line showing how even under the Clinton proposal if adopted as proposed by President Clinton without one change by either body, you are still going to have at the end of 4 years, \$5.8 trillion, at the end of 5 years \$6.2 trillion if this program goes through just the way President Clinton proposes it.

Now, I want to say that you know I have made a great deal in two speeches on this floor during this debate about how the debt had gone up so much under the first Reagan term, so much under the second Reagan term, and so much under the Bush term, as compared to the \$1 trillion that it took 200 years to reach.

You know that makes it sound like the President of the United States is the one that is responsible for the deficit. I always say you can charge a President with maybe lack of leadership when things like this happen but when you get right down to the bottom line of why does it happen the answer to why it happened and how it happened is the Congress of the United States and the Constitution of the United States that gives this body and the other body the power of the purse, and it is a legal fact of life in American processes of government that a President of the United States cannot spend one penny that we in the Congress do not give him the authority to spend.

And so, you know for the first 6 years of the Reagan Presidency there was a Republican Senate and Democratic House. The last 6 years, and you will find a massive increase here, because of the 1990 budget resolution and also with Democrats gaining control of the both Houses of the Congress, the fact is that if anybody thinks that this Republican just blames Republican Presidents, I blame where the Constitution responsibility and power lies and that is with the Congress of the United States appropriating too much money.

I charge Republican Presidents with maybe not vetoing enough bills, or using the jawboning powers they have to suggest to Congress to spend less money or maybe not even proposing lower levels of expenditure in the first place.

The per capita effect of all this debt as of today is \$17,600 per man, woman, and child in America. This proposed budget plan by the Democrats, as I totaled it up, would add another \$1.4 trillion to that and that would increase the per capita debt for each man, woman, and child in America from the present \$17,600 up to \$24,400. It is an increase of 39 percent in the debt burden of each American, and I ought to remind people that on an annualized basis that is an 8-percent increase in the debt and we are only going to have 3.8 percent inflation over that same period of time.

So, you know it is one thing to borrow to keep programs going to maybe make up for inflation, but it is quite another and even worse policy to borrow money twice the rate of inflation so that we can spend here and then raise taxes in the process. And you know what we never learn here when we talk about raising taxes or borrowing money to spend more. It is just a simple fact of life that you cannot raise taxes high enough to satisfy the appetite of Congress to spend money and not just during this period of time, but for the last 50 years we have been taxing \$1 and spending \$1.57. So, you know, we have to do something about our appetite to spend money if we are really going to get this debt under control.

I think that this is more than enough justification, because of this increase in the debt, to take care of the deficit and debt problem before we add new spending, and that is why I am proposing that we freeze and not add new spending and, as I said, this would save \$104 billion of the debt.

I am not sure my colleagues are aware of what the deficit baseline does in the outyears, and that is beyond what is on this chart which ends in 1998. It ought to be an absolute shock to all of us what happens and if my colleagues are aware of what happens I hope that they would be shocked. Page 38 of our budget resolution here is called Budget Outlook. I am not going to turn to the page and read from it, but it shows what the deficit will be in just 5 years after this 5-year budget, the 5-year budget that we are working on right now in the Senate. If we take no action, it is going to show that the deficit would be \$653 billion in the year 2003, \$653 billion.

Now in this budget we see only 5 years out. Obviously, the changes in this budget will lower that deficit number in the year 2003, but if that number starts moving up toward \$400 billion, even after we pass this package, we are in big, big trouble.

This is a fantastic growth that is irresponsible and what is even more important is this chart shows the green being what Reagan twice and Bush once thought they were going to have in a deficit, and it ended up this big. This is what Congress thought they were going to have and we based our budgets on this as well, and it came out this much. But you see this is what they had hoped to have and this is what they ended up having. Just to think this is what Clinton hopes to have this as his proposed deficit and if reality follows the path of the last three administrations you know this figure as a matter of reality is going to be much higher, so instead of having \$871 billion accumulated for the deficit for 4 years, we are going to have much worse than that.

I think I want to help the other side of the aisle and help candidate Clinton keep his promises. Last summer he said that he would not raise taxes on the middle class if the deficit would grow. Candidate Clinton said he would reduce new spending rather than increase taxes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Iowa he has consumed 15 minutes of his time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I am going to yield the floor for a few minutes for a response.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for according me some time to speak this morning.

First, I commend my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, for his initiative here and his thoughtfulness which is characteristic, and it is with some regret that I oppose the amendment which my friend from Iowa has submitted. I do make this opposition, and I do state this opposition not because I disagree with the objectives which Senator GRASSLEY has articulated but because I think that it is unrealistic, really counterproductive to talk in terms of an overall freeze.

When the distinguished Senator from Iowa talks about his interest in having \$104 billion in savings, I agree with him, and it is possible that we might even be able to have more than that in savings, but when the Senator from Iowa talks about a freeze on non-defense discretionary spending, that is a standard which I think the Congress ought not to adopt but instead ought to look at the programs individually to see which ones can be cut and to acknowledge the fact that there are some which may require increases.

I serve as the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and when the chairman of that subcommittee, Senator HARKIN, and I review those voluminous sheets it is an excruciating job to make a determination as to what those allocations ought to be. And there are many of those programs which ought to be cut. There are some of those programs which ought to be increased. And if we approach the budget in terms of a freeze, we are not going to be giving that individual attention.

Illustrative of the kinds of programs which require an increase are the programs like Healthy Start which was put into effect recently after years of intensive effort by this Senator to give prenatal care and postnatal care to young women, many in their teens who are delivering babies which weigh a pound, 18, and 20 ounces, to a child about as big as my hand. It is a human tragedy and a financial heavy cost ranging up to \$150,000 per child. Or when you take a look at some of the programs in health care to try to divert some of the medical students away from the specialists and to rural health care, there again is an area where some increased costs may be required. In the labor field when you talk about mine safety, there is a need in some of those areas to have increases.

So I believe what is necessary today, Mr. President, is a very close, hard, analytical look at the budget in its entirety.

As tempting as it is to talk about a freeze, and as good as that may look when the summaries of votes are printed in the newspapers, or as good as it may look on a press release, I believe that it is unrealistic, and especially so, as we look at the fiscal year 1994 budget.

We are facing more problems and more complex issues this year. As we have a new administration with President Clinton and as we have the very heavy proposals on increased taxation and the heavy proposals on new programs, I believe that we absolutely have to tackle the deficit.

I have long supported the line-item veto and a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. But the way to get there from here is not with any generalizations, as attractive as they may appear on the surface, but, instead, a hard line-by-line analysis, where we will have an eye to cutting programs, but where, realistically, we must look to see what programs may require an increase in funding. And that is the kind of individual analysis which I think the Congress has to undertake this year.

So it is for those reasons, briefly stated, that I am constrained, with reluctance, to oppose the work of my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY.

I have served with him for the 12 years-plus that I have been in the Sen-

ate. We sit next to each other on the Judiciary Committee. He has been, for a time, on the Appropriations Committee. His motives are of the best. But I think we are going to have to take a look individually, as opposed to the generalization of a total freeze.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would like to make a response to my friend from Pennsylvania, and also I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is in the chair as President pro tempore.

I think the important thing to remember is that we are working on a budget. The Senator from Pennsylvania complains that this is going to not give discretion. We are freezing function by function here. It gives the Appropriations Committee an ample opportunity to adjust within the function certain programs to meet the needs of the day. And I admit that those change.

So we are freezing the function number and not the specific program that the distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee is concerned about.

The other thing, I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and all of my colleagues, including the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is the fact that the President of the United States himself has suggested that some of these programs not just be frozen, but some of these programs be cut. And you have to deal with that, as well.

So I do not think there is anything egregious or anything that denies too much discretion to the Appropriations Committee in this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Pennsylvania may require.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I shall not take long.

I do not have too much opportunity to debate with my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, on the floor. We have quite a few discussions privately, but not too many on the floor. But I do want to make a responsive comment.

When the distinguished Senator from Iowa talks about freezes within functions, that poses the precise problem that I was describing in my earlier 5-minute presentation. There is some flexibility within the functions, but if there is a freeze on the function, you cannot go above that level.

And let me say very emphatically that when we go over these sheets—and I do not think the American people

have an idea as to how complicated they are. The Presiding Officer, the distinguished President pro tempore, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, knows they are enormous. And even within functions we need some flexibility and we need to make a hard analysis.

The difficulty is, if you talk about a freeze, that raises a presumption pretty close to an irrefutable presumption—I do not want to get involved in that too much—that the programs will stay, that they will be retained where they really ought to be cut.

And where my distinguished friend from Iowa—he is talking to another of the survivors of the class of 1980; there are only five of us left—makes a comment about the President wanting to cut some programs, he is making my argument.

If you adopt the Grassley amendment and you have a freeze, then the presumption is that the programs are going to stay at their current level.

I know this is a generalization and you can make modifications within. But I know that argument would be advanced for every program, if there is any possibility of a cut.

So when Senator GRASSLEY comments about what President Clinton has said about cutting, that is precisely the point that this Senator was making earlier.

I know this is a good-faith disagreement, but I hope my colleagues will reject this amendment, notwithstanding the very fine motivation by the proposer of the amendment.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, I think, hits the nail on the head. The time for these so-called freezes has passed. The time now is for us to make the hard choices, to make the difficult choices, and decide which programs or which initiatives need to be funded at current services levels, which need to be increased, and which need to be decreased. And, of course, that is something that does not lend itself to a freeze.

One important point of clarification: The freeze that is being proposed here by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, my good friend, is not the same as the House-passed freeze. It is not even close.

I will be getting the difference in numbers here very soon, but just let me make a larger point.

As we now calculate it, we are talking about reducing domestic discretionary spending by about \$119 billion over 5 years.

Let me just demonstrate what we are up against. We have just had a vote

here on one of the central elements of the Clinton investment package. In that vote, the Senate, by an overwhelming majority—84 to 12—voted to fully fund President Clinton's initiative in the Head Start Program. Twenty-nine Senators from the minority side voted in favor of the President's initiative to fully fund Head Start. Even the sponsor of this freeze amendment, Senator GRASSLEY, just voted in favor of Senator KENNEDY's amendment in support of additional spending for Head Start.

The President has proposed \$14.5 billion in increases above inflation for Head Start over the next 6 years. He proposes to cut the headroom for the Head Start increases. That is precisely what my friend from Iowa is proposing.

This demonstrates that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say, "I am for a freeze; I want to freeze all these domestic discretionary programs," and then turn around and vote to fully fund Head Start to the tune of \$14.5 billion in increases in the Head Start Program over the next 5 years.

Now, what is going to happen on this Grassley freeze initiative here this morning?

Are the 29 Senators on the other side of the aisle who just voted to raise Head Start funding by \$14.5 billion between now and 1998, are they now going to come down and vote for the freeze? That is precisely the kind of ploy that causes the American people to lose faith.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, that is precisely why they are not seen as being serious about dealing with the deficit problem or proposing any kind of significant, meaningful alternative to this President's economic proposals or his budget proposals.

President Clinton went before the American people in a joint session of Congress, and he stated specifically what he was going to do. He said: Look, the ox is in the ditch. We have a serious problem in this country. I am not going to blame the minority. I am not going to blame Presidents who came before me. There is enough blame to go around for everybody.

What the President said, quite candidly, and I thought very courageously, was: I am going to play the hand that has been dealt me.

Then he proceeded to lay out to the American people what needed to be done. First, to reduce these gargantuan deficits; and, second, to get our economy moving once again, to make it productive, to make it start creating jobs for our citizens who want work.

He told the American people there is going to have to be some shared contribution from all of us.

Contrast that with these efforts to pick, pick, pick, pick at the President's proposals and his economic reform plan and his budget that is on the floor here

today. We have seen no comprehensive alternative. We simply see a pick, pick, pick—pick here, pick there. But there is no plan.

This is the second amendment coming from the minority side, and it is one that simply proposes an unspecified freeze with no specifics whatsoever. I congratulate the Senator for at least spreading his freeze across the functions. But this still does not make the hard choices that are going to have to be made.

Let me just address a question to my friend from Iowa. We have, according to one calculation, approximately \$103 billion in an across-the-board freeze coming out of discretionary accounts, according to his proposal. Another calculation we made has \$119 billion. So you lower the overall discretionary total by one of those amounts.

Defense makes up over one-half of that total discretionary pot.

Do you contemplate a 55 percent or so—of your freeze or cuts—coming out of the defense budget?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I specifically said, and the amendment is written accordingly, Mr. President, that it is non-defense discretionary expenditure. And the figure is \$104 billion.

Mr. SASSER. I thank you for answering my question. You see, here we are with the cold war effectively over, with our only potential opponent, the only other superpower now not only not a superpower, but coming to the United States and the whole so-called free world with its hand out, begging—begging.

Our citizens here in this country are deeply concerned about the education of our children. By any standard we read these days, we find that the students here in this country, the United States, are not getting the same quality of education as students in Japan, students in Germany, students in France, students in Korea. Our people are concerned about education. Yet, with the cold war over, here we have a freeze that cuts money out of discretionary spending and leaves the money for the weapons and the military untouched.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SASSER. I will be pleased to yield to my friend for a question.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Sure. First of all, remember we are not freezing defense. We are cutting defense in this budget, and have been cutting defense since 1990.

The point you are making in opposition to my amendment—just remember, I have already taken a stand with you on cutting more defense.

Mr. SASSER. I appreciate what you are saying. I yielded for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will allow the Chair to make an observation, under the rules, the Senators are to address one another

through the Chair and in the third person; not in the second person. And the Chair apologizes for the interruption.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, what we have before us is a national problem. Some say it is a national crisis.

It is no exaggeration to say it is a national disgrace. And you have but to walk a scant six or seven blocks from this Capitol Building and you will see it. It is the deterioration and decay of our cities. It is a culture that now has become firmly embedded in criminality.

We have in the urban areas of this country a danger that prevents law-abiding citizens from walking the streets. And what we need to deal with these problems is not a freeze across the discretionary spending programs that might bring jobs, that might bring education, that might bring the forces of law and order through the agencies of the Federal criminal justice system to bear on this problem; what we need is not a freeze, what we need is an increase in our efforts in those particular areas.

What about the health of our citizens? That is a very, very serious and very difficult problem, as pointed out earlier by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania on the floor, the ranking member of the Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee. He pointed out that there are many areas in the jurisdiction of that Appropriations subcommittee where there need to be increases, not a freeze. And he pointed out clearly if this freeze becomes effective, or if the Senate should approve this freeze, that assumption would carry very great weight in the Appropriations subcommittees themselves.

I say to my colleagues that if there is one thing that is crystal clear in the election this last November, it is that there is a mandate for change in this country. The incumbent President who was defeated in November got—if memory serves me correctly—what, 38 percent of the vote, nationally? I do not remember precisely, but a shockingly small percentage of the American people voted to maintain the status quo; voted to stay the course, to use the slogan that was so popular a few years ago.

No, the American people voted for a change. They want change. They want us to start investing in this country again. The American people are asking us to look homeward. They are asking us to examine what we have neglected right here at home; to do something about our schools and our cities and our health care system, and our rural communities; to do something for the hard-working Americans who have lost their jobs and who cannot find new ones.

So the answer to that carry from the heartland, do we answer that with over

100 billion dollars' worth of indiscriminate, unspecified cuts that are aimed—where? Squarely at home. Squarely at those very targeted investments that 84 U.S. Senators just voted for—for example, to increase funding for this Head Start Program.

President Clinton's investment program is structured to respond to the needs of this country, and that is why the polls are showing that the American people, by over a 2-to-1 margin, are supporting his program even though they know it is going to mean increased contributions from them, increased taxes, if you will. By over 2 to 1 they supported this when contrasted with a program emanating from the other side that says let us just keep it the way it is and not do anything.

Mr. President, this kind of amendment should not be adopted by the Senate. I have great admiration for my friend from Iowa. He knows that. We have collaborated together on many other matters in times past and, I think, worked together very effectively. But I say to my friend from Iowa we have already scaled back the investment package in the original Clinton plan by \$40 billion in savings in the Senate Budget Committee Resolution that is on the floor, and we spread it specifically across the board. We did it because we needed to comply with the caps that were in law placed there by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1974 and 1975.

Let me just say this. This deficit reduction package that is before us today, I say to my friend the Senator from Michigan, is massive—is massive—\$502 billion in deficit reduction, the largest deficit reduction package in the history of the United States of America.

The President indicated to some of us privately—and now it has been broadcast across the land from this Senate floor so I suppose we can talk about it—that the Prime Minister of Great Britain had expressed concern about the magnitude of this deficit reduction package because of the fiscal drag that it would attach to the economy of the United States.

Now, if we move forward as my friend from Iowa is proposing and tack on another \$100 billion to this deficit reduction package, that would in all likelihood create just enough downward force, create just enough fiscal drag to push this economy, which is struggling to come out of recession now, into a tailspin. It is just not well calibrated economically. And we all know what happens when the economy goes into a tailspin, when we fall off into recession. We know what happens. Revenues fall off as unemployment goes up. For every 1 percent the unemployment rate goes up, it costs the Federal Government; it raises the deficit by more than \$50 billion.

We have to get this recession behind us and get this economic recovery to

creating jobs. So what we have done, in collaboration with President Clinton, is to create a finely calibrated, well-thought-out, relatively precise budget resolution which will reduce the deficit by over \$500 billion over 5 years but do it in such a manner that it will not throttle this recovery in the cradle.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is remaining on my side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. SASSER. I will yield the floor now, Mr. President.

Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I see my friend from—

Mr. RIEGLE. I might just inquire of you—I know Senator GRASSLEY is ready to speak. I would like some time, if you could yield it to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will please address other Senators in the third person, not in the second person.

Mr. RIEGLE. I appreciate the advice of the Chair.

Mr. SASSER. Let me just say, Mr. President, I will be pleased to yield time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. We have been alternating. Perhaps it would be best, if the distinguished Senator from Iowa wishes to proceed, if we were to yield to him.

Mr. RIEGLE. Before the Senator proceeds, if the Senator from Iowa will indicate how long he may take so I can plan, I would like to be here to be able to speak following the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my plan is to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma. Before that I have two unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators SMITH and DOLE as cosponsors.

AMENDMENT 184, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GRASSLEY. Second, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified—and this is a technical change—on page 6 to indicate a decrease in each of those amounts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection to the several requests. They are granted.

The amendment (No. 184), as modified, is as follows:

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$800,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$500,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$300,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$800,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$2,200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$200,000,000.

On page 14, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$100,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$300,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$200,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$500,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$600,000,000.

On page 15, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$500,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$800,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$700,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$800,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 16, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$3,600,000,000.

On page 17, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$2,900,000,000.

On page 18, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$100,000,000.

On page 18, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$300,000,000.

On page 18, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$200,000,000.

On page 18, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$400,000,000.

On page 18, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$400,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$600,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$500,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$700,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$700,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$200,000,000.

On page 19, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$100,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$300,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$200,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$400,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$400,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$600,000,000.

On page 20, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$500,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$700,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$700,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$500,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 21, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$1,800,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$2,900,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 22, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$3,900,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$200,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$100,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$500,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$200,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$700,000,000.

On page 23, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$400,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$900,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$600,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$1,100,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$800,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$1,100,000,000.

On page 24, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$300,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$2,200,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$4,100,000,000.

On page 25, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$5,200,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$4,200,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$600,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$300,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 26, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$900,000,000.
 On page 26, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$1,800,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$1,500,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$2,400,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$2,100,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$3,100,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$2,700,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$100,000,000.
 On page 27, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$100,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$300,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$300,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$400,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$500,000,000.
 On page 29, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$700,000,000.
 On page 29, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$700,000,000.
 On page 30, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$800,000,000.
 On page 30, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$400,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,400,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$800,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$2,000,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,200,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$2,700,000,000.
 On page 31, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$1,700,000,000.
 On page 32, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$3,400,000,000.
 On page 32, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$2,200,000,000.
 On page 32, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$100,000,000.
 On page 32, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$200,000,000.
 On page 32, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$300,000,000.
 On page 33, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$400,000,000.
 On page 33, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$500,000,000.
 On page 33, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$700,000,000.
 On page 33, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$1,300,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,200,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$1,900,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,800,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$2,600,000,000.
 On page 34, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$2,400,000,000.
 On page 35, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$3,200,000,000.
 On page 35, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 35, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$500,000,000.
 On page 35, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$1,100,000,000.
 On page 35, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$900,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$1,600,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$1,400,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$2,100,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$2,000,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$2,600,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$2,500,000,000.
 On page 36, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$1,200,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$1,100,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,800,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$1,700,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$2,400,000,000.
 On page 37, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$2,300,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$3,100,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$3,000,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$100,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$100,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$600,000,000.
 On page 38, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$1,600,000,000.
 On page 39, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$1,600,000,000.
 On page 39, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$3,000,000,000.
 On page 39, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$3,000,000,000.
 On page 39, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$4,900,000,000.
 On page 39, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$4,900,000,000.
 On page 7, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$5,000,000,000.
 On page 7, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$17,000,000,000.
 On page 7, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$37,000,000,000.
 On page 7, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$65,700,000,000.
 On page 7, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$103,900,000,000.
 On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$5,000,000,000.
 On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$17,000,000,000.
 On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$37,000,000,000.
 On page 4, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$65,700,000,000.
 On page 4, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$103,900,000,000.
 On page 8, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$5,000,000,000.
 On page 8, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$37,000,000,000.
 On page 8, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$65,700,000,000.
 On page 8, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$103,900,000,000.
 On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$5,000,000,000.
 On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$17,000,000,000.
 On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$37,000,000,000.
 On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$65,700,000,000.
 On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$103,900,000,000.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Chair.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Iowa. He has shown consistency and he has shown courage. I might tell the Presiding Officer and my other colleagues that Senator GRASSLEY and I came to the Senate at the same time. I remember a Grassley freeze amendment back in the early 1980's. I remember cosponsoring a Grassley-Nickles freeze amendment with Senator HOLINGS and a couple other Senators. So the Senator from Iowa has shown great consistency and he has shown great courage on this issue, and I respect that because he did it when it was not popular even on our side of the aisle. I respect somebody who stands for principle and does it consistently and sometimes when it is not an easy thing to do.

I wish to make a couple of comments, Mr. President, in regard to the comments made by the chairman of the Budget Committee. He mentioned that this is a \$502 deficit reduction package. Those are his words. They are not the words of the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that this deficit reduction package totals \$458 billion, and it is not the largest deficit reduction package in history. I might mention that in 1990 we had a so-called deficit reduction package which was going to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. I will tell my colleagues that it did not reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. What it did, is aggravated a recession. It expanded a recession because of increased taxes.

I also tell my colleagues that the tax increases proposed in this resolution are twice as high as the tax increases proposed in the 1990 budget resolution. I fear that the budget resolution we are getting ready to pass—and I can tell the majority has the votes in order and they are going to pass it. They are going to keep everybody lined up, and they are going to pass this resolution. But I really fear what it is going to do to the coal industry, to the oil and gas industry, to the airline industry, to the farmers and ranchers, to the people who are exporting products. I think

this budget and the bill that is going to come out of it as a result of reconciliation are going to put a lot of people out of work.

The Senator from Iowa has an amendment—I had one last night and, unfortunately, we failed by a few votes, but we had our chance, and we had a good debate. I respect the Presiding Officer, the Senator from West Virginia, because he stood on his principles. He has talked about investment ever since I have been in this body, and he talked about it last night and spoke well. And he carried the day.

But the Senator from Iowa has an amendment today which would just cut taxes and spending. It is very straightforward. He says let's cut spending. It may total \$104 billion or \$119 billion. I hope it is \$119 billion, and I hope his amendment will pass. I believe very strongly that we can afford to do it.

I have heard people say, that, if we pass this amendment, we will not have money for education; we will not have it for health; we will not have it for infrastructure; we will not have it for Head Start.

And I might say, for my colleagues that voted for full funding for Head Start, that the budget resolution we have before us right now does not fully fund Head Start. We do not fully fund Head Start in this budget until 1999.

What we do is spend a lot of money in this budget. A lot of times my colleagues lose sight of where we are. This chart refers to the fact that spending has really been increasing. Taxes have been relatively constant for the last couple of years, and spending has been exploding.

Under this budget resolution, we have big taxes, the largest tax increase ever proposed in history; \$359 billion in new taxes, \$64 billion in tax cuts—most of those will not do anything really for the economy—for a net tax increase of \$295 billion. There are also users fees that will really hurt the mining industry and other industries, of \$18 billion.

What does this budget due to spending? It contains \$124 billion in so-called investments. That is spending, in many cases politician's pork barrel. It cuts spending \$131 billion, for a net spending cut of \$7 billion.

Let us compare the spending cuts versus the tax increases. The tax in-

creases are \$295 billion. The net domestic spending cuts are \$7 billion. There is no comparison.

But wait a minute. I thought I heard President Clinton say something different in his State of the Union Speech. I believe that people should be held accountable for what they say. I respect Senators when they say something. I expect they mean it. I expect the President of the United States to mean it. He stated in the State of the Union, that this package was balanced. He said it will have just as much in spending cuts as we will have in tax increases.

Mr. President, those are not the facts. The facts are that this package has \$3.85 in tax increases for every \$1 of spending cuts. That is not balanced. That is not fair. That is recessionary, in my opinion. The tax increases of 1990 put a lot of people out of work. The tax increases in this package are going to put a lot more people out of work and make a lot more people dependent on Government assistance. I fear that is exactly the route that we are heading.

For those who think this amendment's cut of \$119 billion over the next 5 years will just emasculate our ability to spend money, over the next 5 years under the so-called modified budget we are going to spend over \$8 trillion. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa would reduce that by \$100-plus billion. Big deal.

I look at the amount of new money we will spend on nondefense, and mandatory spending, over the next 5 years compared to 1993. We will spend \$1 trillion more in the next 5 years than what we are spending this year.

If we could actually not spend any more than we are spending today, 1993, we could balance this budget. We are now spending \$1.5 trillion. There are 12 zeros in a trillion dollars. I know the Presiding Officer understands that. That is equal to \$6,000 for every man, woman and child in the United States. That is a lot of money.

But we are not going to spend just that amount of money. Spending will increase dramatically. Nondefense and mandatory, 1994, increases by \$67 billion; 1995, \$136 billion; 1996, \$191 billion; 1997, \$267 billion; and by 1998, \$356 billion.

That is \$1.18 trillion of additional moneys we will spend in nondefense areas just compared to 1993. The Senator's amendment does not say we are only going to spend what we spend in 1993. He says we are going to freeze domestic discretionary. He will allow all the entitlement programs to continue to grow.

I hope we will have an amendment later by me and others that will try to cap entitlements because entitlements are exploding in cost. Medicaid last year, 29 percent growth increase. And this administration is running around handing out hundreds of millions of dollars to States so Medicaid will increase even more. Unemployment compensation grew at 48 percent last year. Not 4.8 percent, I said 48 percent. Yet, Congress has already passed an unemployment extension expanding that \$5.8 billion. Did we pay for it? No. That was \$5.8 billion. All that did was increase the deficit.

Is it not interesting to note that the net domestic spending cuts over the next 5 years under President Clinton's package, the budget before us, is \$7 billion, and we have already spent it. We are spending \$5.8 billion increasing the deficit. That already wipes out the net domestic spending.

So really what you have in this package, in the budget package we have before us, is massive tax increases and cutting defense. That is it. That is it. That is it in its totality. What you are looking at doing is really, I think, suffocating our economy.

What the Senator from Iowa says, let's have some spending cuts if we are going to increase taxes \$313 billion. Let's at least cut \$100 billion in spending. Over the next 5 years we will spend over \$8 trillion. Surely we can cut \$100 billion. He happens to be exactly right. I compliment the Senator from Iowa, and I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have several tables printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CBO CAPPED BASELINE

	Growth over 1993					Total
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	
Revenues	71	147	212	270	338	1,038
Defense	(19)	(26)	(18)	(11)	(3)	(77)
Non-Defense	11	19	26	34	41	131
Subtotal, discretionary	(8)	(7)	8	23	38	54
Social Security	17	33	49	66	83	248
Other mandatory	30	70	92	131	185	507
Subtotal, mandatory	47	103	141	197	268	756
Offsetting receipts	(4)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(14)	(45)
Debt service	13	33	53	73	95	265
Outlays	48	121	192	281	387	1,030

CBO CAPPED BASELINE—Continued

	Growth over 1993					Total
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	
Deficits						
Addendum:	23	26	20	(12)	(50)	8
Non-Defense and mandatory with interest	67	147	211	292	390	1,107
Non-Defense and mandatory without interest	54	114	158	220	296	842

PRESIDENT'S PLAN—MODIFIED

	Growth over 1993					Total
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	
Revenues	108	193	275	345	412	1,333
Defense	(16)	(21)	(29)	(44)	(41)	(151)
Non-Defense	15	19	28	42	56	159
Subtotal, discretionary	(2)	(2)	(1)	(3)	15	8
Social Security	17	33	49	66	83	248
Other mandatory	31	69	85	120	168	472
Subtotal, mandatory	48	102	134	186	251	720
Offsetting receipts	(6)	(11)	(13)	(15)	(18)	(63)
Debt service	11	27	42	55	67	202
Outlays	51	116	162	222	315	867
Deficits	56	77	113	123	96	466
Addendum:						
Non-Defense and mandatory with interest	67	137	191	267	356	1,018
Non-Defense and mandatory without interest	57	110	149	212	289	816

CBO CAPPED BASELINE

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 1994-98	Change 1993-98
Revenues	1,143	1,214	1,290	1,355	1,413	1,481	6,753	338
Defense	294	275	268	276	283	291	1,393	(3)
Non-Defense	253	264	272	279	287	294	1,396	41
Subtotal, discretionary	547	539	540	555	570	585	2,789	38
Social Security	302	319	335	351	368	385	1,758	83
Other mandatory	471	501	541	563	602	656	2,862	185
Subtotal, mandatory	773	820	876	914	970	1,041	4,621	268
Offsetting receipts	(65)	(69)	(73)	(74)	(76)	(79)	(370)	(14)
Debt service	198	211	231	251	271	293	1,255	95
Outlays	1,453	1,501	1,574	1,645	1,734	1,840	8,295	387
Deficits	(310)	(287)	(284)	(290)	(322)	(360)	(1,542)	(50)

CHANGE TO BASELINE

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 1994-98
Revenues	36	46	63	76	74	295
Defense	3	5	(10)	(34)	(37)	(74)
Non-Defense	4	(0)	2	8	14	28
Subtotal, discretionary	7	5	(9)	(26)	(23)	(46)
Social Security	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other mandatory	1	(1)	(7)	(11)	(17)	(35)
Subtotal, mandatory	1	(1)	(7)	(11)	(17)	(35)
Offsetting receipts	(3)	(3)	(5)	(4)	(4)	(18)
Debt service	(2)	(6)	(11)	(18)	(27)	(64)
Outlays	3	(5)	(31)	(59)	(72)	(163)
Deficits	(33)	(51)	(93)	(135)	(146)	(458)

PRESIDENT'S PLAN—MODIFIED

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 1994-98	Change 1993-98
Revenues	1,143	1,251	1,336	1,418	1,488	1,555	7,048	412
Defense	294	278	273	265	250	253	1,319	(41)
Non-Defense	253	268	272	281	295	309	1,424	56
Subtotal, discretionary	547	545	545	546	544	562	2,743	15
Social Security	302	319	335	351	368	385	1,758	83
Other mandatory	471	502	540	556	591	639	2,827	168
Subtotal, mandatory	773	821	875	907	959	1,024	4,585	251
Offsetting receipts	(65)	(71)	(76)	(78)	(80)	(83)	(388)	(18)
Debt service	198	209	225	240	253	265	1,192	67
Outlays	1,453	1,504	1,569	1,615	1,675	1,768	8,132	315

PRESIDENT'S PLAN—MODIFIED—Continued

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 1994-98	Change 1993-98
Deficits	(310)	(254)	(233)	(197)	(187)	(214)	(1,084)	96

Note.—Details may not add due to rounding. Includes \$12,000,000,000 in stimulus spending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, thank you.

I thank my good friend, the distinguished manager of this bill, Senator SASSER, for allowing me to speak for a few minutes on this amendment.

First of all, I say to my good friend from Iowa, I have a great respect for him. I consider him one of the more thoughtful and one of the more courageous Senators here.

Let me also say in a form of exculpation of my own past conduct, that I have voted for budget freezes in the past after what can only be described as the unmitigated economic and tax disaster of 1981. When the 1981 tax cut started leading to these budget deficits, I supported freeze amendments. I must say in a self-serving way I predicted in a speech an hour before we passed that 1981 tax cut bill, I said if you pass this and you are going to create deficits "big enough to choke a mule." And we passed it, and we created deficits big enough to choke a mule.

Senator HOLLINGS of South Carolina then became the leader in the Senate on precisely what the Senator is trying to do here, freeze spending. I was a lot more concerned then about freezing defense spending than I was about domestic discretionary spending, but I supported Senator HOLLINGS on several occasions.

But subsequent to that time, as recently as last year, the President pro tempore, the Presiding Officer, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, all one person, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD from West Virginia, did extensive studies about where all the money went after 1981.

I said last evening, but it will bear repeating right now, defense spending doubled. I can remember Jimmy Carter's last year in the Presidency, the defense budget was \$145 billion. Shortly thereafter, it went to \$300 billion.

The study of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee further showed that entitlements or mandatory spending went up 140 percent, or some such figure as that.

Contrary to what the people across the country believe, foreign aid stayed virtually stagnant.

But the thing that was the shocker in the chairman's study was that domestic discretionary spending, which is what the Senator's amendment seeks to address here, domestic discretionary spending, which is what we spend for childhood immunizations, housing, health care, highways, student loans, what we spend to make ourselves a better educated, more prosperous people, more cultured people, had hardly gone up a dime. Think about that.

So while I would like to support a freeze, we now have a President who is saying: "I intend to do something about the deficit." We had a President 12 years ago who said: "I am giving you my solemn promise that if you will trust me, we will balance the budget." The American people believed him, and they put their faith in him, and they voted for him overwhelmingly two times. Since he held up his hand and said, "I will faithfully protect, defend, and preserve the Constitution of the United States," we have spent \$3 trillion that we did not have.

You do not have to be a rocket scientist to understand all of this. I just got through saying where the money went, and it did not go for domestic discretionary spending.

When I was joining with my friend from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, in trying to freeze spending, I was desperate. It was the only thing I knew to do. So I cosponsored his amendments. I am still desperate but, happily, I have a colleague who is also desperate, and his name is William Jefferson Clinton. He said to the American people in his State of the Union Address: Folks, this is it on letting these deficits sky rocket. He said, without saying, I would rather not tell you these unpleasant facts.

I have to say that I really do not include my friend from Iowa in this, but I can tell you one thing; I heard a lot of speeches over here in the last 24 hours and, as I say, I specifically exempt my friend from Iowa from this, which said, in effect, doing the same old thing is the solution; do nothing. And every study shows that if you do nothing, we will have a \$7.5 trillion national debt in the year 2003.

Again, borrowing a page out of Ronald Reagan's book, that amendment is equivalent to a string of \$1 bills laid end-to-end that will reach to the Sun and back 3½ times. Think about that. I think President Reagan used a metaphor of one-hundred-dollar bills. He said the debt was equal to a stack of bills 67 miles high, just peanuts compared to what it is now—67 miles high. I remember it now. A stack of thousand dollar bills 67 miles, and every-

body "oohed and aahhed" and said: this not unbelievable? I am sorry Ronald Reagan cannot be here today to tell us how high that stack would be now. I will tell you how high it would be. It would be four times a thousand—no, I am not that good a mathematician. I am talking about dollar bills, so we know it would be a thousand times higher than that times three for the \$3 trillion.

The Senator comes in and says, the thing that will make our children healthier and better educated and make us more competitive and provide job training for people who have lost their jobs, the Senator is saying, let us freeze that spending.

This budget resolution is a first step in cutting the size of this deficit, the deficit between now and 1998, by \$500 billion. The chart the Senator has up over there about the future deficits, I do not quarrel with that. What I quarrel with is something that is left unsaid, and that is what the deficit is going to be if we do not adopt this resolution. Everybody knows. Yes, the deficit in 1998 is going to be \$200 billion. But if you do nothing, who knows what it is going to be. It is going to be at least \$350 billion to \$500 billion. So everybody is saying, "let us do nothing," because the national debt is going to be \$6.2 trillion in 1998. What is left unsaid is that it is going to be a lot bigger than that unless we adopt this resolution and start imposing some discipline on ourselves.

Once we adopt this resolution, the Appropriations Committee is going to go through the 602(b) allocation process. You know what we have to do in the 602(b) allocation process? You are not on that committee. You ought to sit around the table with us and see the agony we go through trying to get our spending within the limits that this budget says we have to come up with. And once we do that, you know that it is not easy to come out here and get 60 votes to change it. If you want to add spending that is going to raise the deficit, you have to get 60 votes. If you want to increase spending, that takes 60 votes. If you want to cut taxes, that takes 60 votes.

Last year when I ran for reelection, I listened to a lot of people saying it took only 50 votes to raise taxes and 60 votes to cut taxes. Is that the way it ought to be? Anything that adversely affects the deficit and raises the deficit ought to require 60 votes.

Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Iowa, once again, that I think the Senator from Iowa has supported some of my amendments on the space station, super collider, and I ap-

plaud him for that. I want to assure him I am going to give him a chance to do it again I am going to try to do something about a bloated intelligence budget. Think about it. The New York Times says its budget is \$30 billion. I say that CNN will give you 15 billion dollars' worth of that for free. And SDI, we have spent \$35 billion on that, Mr. President, and we are back to square one. We have discarded seven of the eight technologies we started out with.

Admiral Crowe who I think is the best military man this country has had since George Marshall, said \$2 billion is more than enough for SSI. A solid rocket motor for NASA at \$3.5 billion that they do not even want. There is some spending, Senator.

The space station, it's going back to the drawing board. Why not give that thing a merciful death, instead of going back to the drawing board, and not mess with freezes.

Cut real specific programs. Stiffen your spines, colleagues. Do not go for one of these pap solutions. Just stand right up here and say: I am against this program; I am against that, and we are going to save some real moneys. Senator SASSER, Senator WARNER, Senator COHEN, Senator BRYAN, Senator LAUTENBERG, and I are going to stand on this floor this fall in the appropriations process and give you and your colleagues and our colleagues the chance to save \$350 billion over the next 25 years on these boondoggle programs. You vote with us. I know you will. You have in the past.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will please address other Senators in the third person and not in the second person.

Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. I see the distinguished Senator from Michigan on the floor. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 16 minutes 18 seconds.

Mr. SASSER. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if you will let me ask the chairman a procedural question.

Mr. RIEGLE. If I can do it without losing time off my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Of course.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to engage in a process question with the chairman and it be charged equally.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank Senator RIEGLE.

You inquired of me about an hour ago as to whether the Senator from New Mexico could agree to vote sooner than agreed in the unanimous-consent

agreement. I am trying to do that and probably can do it.

On the other hand, I have sent to the chairman and to the majority leader a suggestion that we not waste all afternoon and just charge it to the resolution because we are going to have a lot of time left over after the three other amendments that are agreed to. I would hope that you would agree that we could offer some additional amendments. I sent them to you by way of the exact title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair apologizes but the rules of the Senate are the rules of the Senate, and they require Senators address other Senators in the third person and not in the second person.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from New Mexico is accustomed to doing otherwise until reminded by the distinguished chairman and Presiding Officer, and it will be difficult. So I do not mind if you continue to interrupt me until I get it right.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that you could let us know whether we can offer some of these amendments this afternoon under some timeframe that is agreeable and that if you want to second degree them, if the Senator or the majority leader wants to second degree them, we would even agree that that can be done next week as part of the voting process?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, we follow the process now of discussing this matter with the majority leader and the Senator from Tennessee will advise the Senator from New Mexico very shortly what would be the disposition of the request to take up these amendments this afternoon.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the chairman and, Senator RIEGLE, I will ask your indulgence for taking the time from what you said. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, just a word or two of background here.

Last year in 1992 here in America, our Government had an economic plan for every country in the world except our own. There was an economic plan for Kuwait, one for Mexico, one for China, and all the other countries, but none for America.

The American people had enough of that. They voted out that administration. They voted for a big change. They voted in a new President because they wanted a new economic plan.

And to the great credit of the new President, President Clinton, he has developed an economic plan. He has brought it forward. It is here now. It is a solid plan. It is a good plan for America. It is a plan to create job growth in our country, to help our people to invest in America for a change, and to

get this economy of ours moving, and to help the people in our society who have not participated in what economic strength there has been, to help them get into the system and get up to higher ground.

So I applaud the President for what he has done, but I will tell you this: The amendment by the Senator from Iowa will cut the heart right out of the President's plan, cut the heart right out of it, because the President's plan is trying to do several important things at once. He's trying to bring down the Federal budget deficit over a period of years, which is necessary but very difficult to do. He is trying to shift the spending priorities in the country so we start to invest more in our people and in job growth and in job preparation so we can have a stronger economy and we can get more of our people participating in the system and able to provide for themselves.

He is also trying to keep inflation down, and already the signal is clear in that area and we have seen the price of long-term Government bonds, the long-term interest rate, drop down. It dropped down again yesterday, and that is enormously helpful to our economy, and it is starting to provide some lift and even some job growth.

So the President's plan is very carefully balanced to achieve these objectives. Central to his plan is the creation in the private sector of our economy an additional 8 million jobs over the next 4 years. It is essential that this job creation take place and much of it is driven by the very shift in priorities that the Senator from Iowa would turn aside and not allow to happen.

For example, he would take and interfere with in his amendment important investments in the highway system, important investments in our mass transit system, in air traffic modernization, in environmental engineering and technology development, and the community development block grants. We know our local communities in many cases are in terrible difficulty. They do not have the financial resources they need just to meet their essential human needs.

Enterprise zones are something we have talked about for years around here. This President wants to get it done and with an enhanced wrap-around approach that it takes to make enterprise zones work.

There is now funding for community development banks and defense conversion. We have all these defense facilities closing. We have to spend money to help the communities adjust to that kind of economic dislocation.

Head Start, child nutrition, and immunization. We can not let our children get sick from diseases. We do not immunize them. We spend \$10 to treat a sick child when we should spend \$1 on the front end to provide the immuniza-

tion to avoid the sickness and in some cases the death and in any event save us money down the line.

The same thing for summer jobs. We have to have summer jobs in this country. We have a massive unemployment rate particularly in inner cities. There is no sign of hope of their being able to get jobs and job training and job experience unless we see that it happens.

That is why we elected a new President. We tried it the other way. We tried it the other way for 12 long years, and we have had all the emphasis on foreign policy, and now we have a President that says let us invest in America and let us change those priorities around.

I want to show you how this business recession we have been in now nearly 2 years looks when you look in terms of just the job creation aspect of it. If you look at the previous seven recessions we have had prior to this one, and you look at the job loss coming down several months into the recession, the bottoming out of job loss and then in past recessions how by 21 months after the start of the recession we are out of the recession and up here we are in positive ground adding jobs to the economy.

This is this recession, the red line. We have not even gotten back and regained the jobs that we had when this recession started. So right now we are down here. We should be up here. That is about 3 to 4 million jobs.

The President is addressing that issue in his plan, and the Grassley amendment cuts right against it and will thwart it.

Here is the story just this week out of the New York Times. It says "New Jobs Lack the Old Security in Times of 'Disposable Workers.' The 40-hour week with benefits is in decline."

It talks about the hollowing out of our job base.

We have to invest in America; we have to invest in our workers. We have to invest in their economic futures, not just look every other place but look at our own people.

Our people in this last election said they want a change. They voted for a change. The President has a plan. He deserves to have that plan supported and we cannot come in here now and start carving it to pieces, because one Senator or another Senator has an idea of his own as to how he would do it if he were President. If you wanted to do that, run for President. See if you can get elected. If you can, then we will take a look at your plan, but do not tackle this President from behind when he is striving to get a plan in place that is balanced and makes sense and that the country needs.

The country wants this kind of change in direction, and we desperately need it.

Here is a recent issue of Business Week magazine, just 2 or 3 weeks ago. The headline of this business journal

is, "Jobs, Jobs, Jobs—The Economy Is Growing But Employment Lags Badly."

The very things on this list are designed to help foster job creation, make people job ready, enrich the job base of the country, invest in our people, invest in the economic strength of the country.

So we cannot cut this out. To come along now and propose cutting this out makes no sense.

I do not say that with disrespect to the Senator from Iowa. He has his point of view. But we have to think about the whole country. We cannot just think about one point of view or one State. We have to think about 50 States, and we have to think about all the people in our country out there who need an opportunity to be able to make a living to provide for themselves and provide for their families.

In just this morning's newspaper there was a story about an elderly, homeless woman in Washington who froze to death last night in an old car in this city. She is just one of many.

Think about the young children out in homeless shelters right now and other people in the country right now who are looking for a chance to have just a little piece of the American dream.

Finally, after 30 years, we get a President elected who wants to do something about helping the people of this country and comes in with a request with a plan to do it.

Now we have people coming from the other side of the aisle and they want to chop it to ribbons. They do not have a coherent plan of their own to put in place.

I say with due respect they are not offering a plan in replacement of this plan. They want to nickel and dime it to death, chip off this, chip off that.

But the part that is being proposed here chips off the very piece that brings hope and promise and possibility to people in our society, who want to produce and need to produce and need to earn a living and need to feed themselves and feed their kids.

That is what this is about, and I am proud finally to have a President who understands that problem and a first lady as well who understands that problem.

We are going to get this economic plan in place and start the job growth and then we are going to reform the health care system so we do not keep turning our back on people in that area as well.

But that is what people voted for. People voted for change. They did not vote for the same old things. But what I see coming here in the way of efforts to take and try to wreck the President's program, it is the same old thing we saw before. We have been down that road.

We had 12 years of that. And this is where it has brought us, right here. We

are getting no real job creation in the country because that whole economic scheme did not work.

So we have to change direction and we have a President with the courage and vision to put a plan on the table that is balanced and fair and that meets all these objectives at once. It deserves support.

We are not going to get this chance again. If we allow this plan to get shot in the back by amendments like this, we are not going to get anything done. We are going to be right back into gridlock. People do not want that. They voted that out. People in both parties and Independents said, "We have had enough of that and we have had enough of having an economic plan for every other country in the world and none for ours."

It is time for a plan for America. President Clinton has given a plan for America. It ought to be recognized and ought to be supported. Let us put it in place. Let us get this country moving again. Let us give our people some chance to get up to higher ground.

More and more people in our society are sliding backward. Even those that had jobs are finding that their real incomes are dropping. Many will lose their health care coverage or their health care coverage is being scaled back. They are working harder and harder and getting less and less for it.

We have a President that understands that problem and wants to reverse it. So he has given us a plan of several parts to get that job done. This is a critical part that has been targeted here by this amendment by the Senator from Iowa. This is a part we need. This is the part that is investing in our own people.

How can we say to our own people who are on the outside looking in that we want to bring them in the economic system, but, "Sorry, we cannot do anything for you. We cannot help you help yourself?"

We help everybody else in every other place. We have a free-trade agreement with Mexico, we have plans for every other country, but, "Sorry, we can't help you."

Baloney. That is over with. People voted that out. They voted for something different. They voted to do something for this country. And, thank goodness, we have a President who is willing to lead. We ought to support him and vote this amendment down.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERREY). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished ranking Member from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for the 10 minutes.

I want to thank the immediate past Presiding Officer, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for reminding us of one of the real cordialities of this institution which suggests that we do not speak to each other in the first tense but, rather, in the third party.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is a reason for this rule. I did not create it.

The reason for the rule is to keep down acerbities in debate. So there is a good reason for the rule. We all fall into the habit; I do myself.

I hesitate to insist on the rule, but it should be followed. It is like pointing a finger at someone. It is rather personal. And the rules are calculated to keep debates impersonal.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me suggest what I think the Grassley amendment is all about and why the Senator from Iowa is doing this, as I view it, and that is because I think it helps the American people understand what is going on in the budget of the United States.

So let me start by, once again, referring back to a quote of note, August 17, 1988, *Newsweek*. This is the quote:

There is a lot of evidence that you can sell people on tax increases if they think they are investment.

Now the person that said that—and I am sure he understood it very, very well—was then-Governor Clinton, now President Clinton. You can sell the American people on tax increases if they think you are going to use the new taxes for an investment.

The problem is that if you ask most Americans, they also think that this economic plan—which has now been encapsulated in a splendid kind of language like it is going to produce 9 million new jobs.

I am sure anybody that has a plan would say it is going to create jobs, because we need jobs.

But I want to remind Senators, there is a very, very big difference between saying it is going to create 8 million or 9 million jobs and the reality of the economy of America and the proposal.

So, essentially, what Senator GRASSLEY is trying to put before us and those who are interested in American fiscal policy—budgeting—is the following:

We have been told that we are going to cut the spending of the Federal Government. What the Senator is suggesting is that this plan before us does not cut the spending of the Federal Government.

In fact, he is saying one simple proposition is true, and it is this. He is saying to Americans: "Fellow Americans, don't you think that we ought to at least freeze the expenditures of our Federal Government as it pertains to domestic spending that we appropriate every year and can control?" He is saying: "Don't you think, after all the

rhetoric is done, that it would be good to start by saying, 'Taxpayers, before we tax you \$295 billion, very simply, we want to freeze the expenditures of our Government.'"

He chooses, in a very simple way, to put that in an amendment and say: "Do you not think that before we tax Americans at every level—poor people, retired people, working poor, rich people—before we tax all of you people, we ought to make sure that something credible, something that you can comprehend, something that you would believe, is going to happen to the Federal budget?"

And he says, as simple as can be: "Freeze it."

Now, is a freeze too onerous? Is a freeze too onerous when you are asking the American people to pay this enormous enough tax to get the deficit under control?

When you take away all of the language that people are using about "you can't do this, you can't do that," the truth of the matter is that a budget freeze is a more appropriate tool to reduce spending in a budget resolution than a litany of things you are going to cut.

We heard eloquent remarks here on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS]. He suggested that we ought to list the items, not the freeze.

Let me make this point. Listing items in this budget resolution as to what you will not spend or what you will spend is in no way binding on the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate. When they are finished, they are going to follow totals and they are going to decide what they add to and what they subtract from.

Senator GRASSLEY is giving them a new overall total in budget authority and outlays that represents clearly that you are not going to let domestic discretionary programs grow regardless of their quality: "You choose"—U.S. Senators and Congressmen—"of this enormous amount that we are going to spend, you choose which ones are investments and which ones are not. But do not spend more than you spent this year."

I hope my friend will agree that is the essence of what he is asking us to do.

So, when you get rid of all the underbrush, with people talking about investments, people talking about specific cutting, his amendment is understandable.

Do you think if you walk down the street and say—and everybody says they support this plan that is before us—I am in Belen, NM—you say: Look, Mr. Chavez, would you think we ought to tax the American people to get the deficit down? And he probably would say, "Well, I am willing to sacrifice."

Then you say, "Well, Mr. Chavez, do you think we ought to tax the Amer-

ican people so the Government can grow?" This Government has been out of control. This diagram shows the problem. Taxes in the United States have not dropped dramatically like some are saying. Do you see the blue line? It is the spending that has gone up dramatically.

So it seems to me the next question you would ask that constituent in New Mexico is, "Do you not think we ought to restrain Government?"

And he would say, "Until you restrain the Government, you ought not tax me." That is what I think he would say. And there is no restraint in this budget other than in defense. In the final analysis, the picking and choosing of winners and losers and cuts and add-ons has yielded essentially, on the domestic side of our budget, no significant cuts. The net effect of adds and minuses is you are just about where you started with them all going up.

So it seems to me that anyone who wants to send the right signal to the Congress and the President that before we put on new taxes we ought to keep faith with the American people and say we are not going to spend any more next year than we did this year in this very large account of our Government.

Frankly, I have been at this long enough where I would tell you my preference. My preference is we do not do this kind of cutting. I do not mean across the board. It is perfectly all right on a budget resolution. But I think we ought to seriously understand that we are not, and the President is not, cutting the part of Government that is growing out of all proportion to reality—the mandatory non-Social Security entitlement programs.

I believe, since everyone says you cannot do that, and if anybody comes down here and talks about it the other side of the aisle goes ballistic because they say you are going to get Medicare and you are going to get Medicaid, so the Senator from Iowa has an alternative. You cannot do anything else, so he is saying freeze it, do not spend any more year after year for the next 5 years on domestic appropriated accounts, and put that in law before you put this big huge tax that has been debated over and over on the floor on the American people.

Frankly, I do not think anybody ought to get mixed up about the Government of the United States producing jobs. Frankly, I do not believe the U.S. Government produces jobs other than those they hire and put on the Federal payroll. I think the private sector produces jobs in the United States. Frankly, I cannot believe we really feel and are going to vote as if taxing our people \$295 billion is going to create jobs.

I close by saying, if anybody finds that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is not specific enough, then I just ask they review the March 18

Federal page of the Washington Post, hardly a newspaper that speaks for us.

Will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the Senator from New Mexico 1 minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Washington Post hardly speaks for our side of the aisle. But let me tell you they are suggesting the budget of the President of the United States that is before us is tremendously lacking in specifics. In fact, the bureaucracy, looking at their own budgets, say we do not know where we are going to cut all these things. Federal streamlining has been an objective. Until somebody tells us what to cut, it is just a nice piece of rhetoric. It says: magic budget-cutting bullets; a touch of wishful thinking; a pinch of Democratic unity.

Frankly, I think the amendment that is before us is far more effective than a magic budget-cutting bullet, where items are stated but then others are added to it, the net effect of which is you do not cut.

I thank the Senator for bringing this to our attention. It is very lucid, it is very easy to understand. I think it is going to begin to educate many Senators, those who are interested, that we are really not cutting the growth of Federal Government in exchange for these taxes we are going to ask our people to pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for a very fine statement in support.

I would like to add Senator FAIRCLOTH as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I then yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, let me commend the Senator from Iowa for his amendment. I am pleased to speak for it and be a cosponsor.

In my speaking to citizens of New York, I would say that, uniformly, they have been supportive of that portion of the President's program as it relates to reducing the deficit.

I have spoken to people of great financial means, wealthy individuals, and they say, "We do not mind paying more provided it reduces the deficit."

I have spoken to working middle-class families who the program will impact. If you own a home in Long Island and you make \$45,000 a year and have two children, you are having a tough time making it. Real property taxes generally average \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year. Commuting into the city is \$200 a month plus; running an automobile is absolutely essential. By the time that family gets done, it has a pretty tough time making it, let alone providing for an opportunity to send their children

to school. Yet, they are willing to make the sacrifice.

But I have to tell you something. We are kidding those people. We are kidding them. We are not making a sacrifice. That new tax money is not going to reduce the deficit. But, that is what Senator GRASSLEY's amendment is intended to do. It says freeze spending because, if we freeze spending and save \$105 billion, that reduces the deficit by \$105 billion.

But what do we have here instead? We have a canard. We have a charade. We have a whole new system of taking money from working families, middle-class families, and sending it to millions of others. And that is wrong. Do you mean to tell me a family that has an income of \$30,000 a year should be taxed \$500 a year more and that is just from the Btu tax.

Let me show you some charts; \$95 billion is what we are going to make Americans pay in the form of a new energy tax. You take a family that has a \$30,000 income and lives out in Long Island or in upstate New York, say Syracuse. You are going to cost them anywhere from \$400 to \$600 a year more and you are going to take \$95 billion out of the overall economy.

By the way, the end, it is incredible. You wind up with nothing—nothing.

And, what we have done is we set up a whole new entitlement program—wonderful. We give out \$7.2 billion more in food stamps; \$25 billion more in ETIC's over a 5-year period of time, almost a 50-percent increase in the Tax Credit Program. Working middle-class families will be taxed so that millions more people can get a check sent from the Federal Government.

Most people do not know what the earned income tax credit is. It means there will be people getting \$1,100 to \$1,400 a year because they are poor. They may have an income of \$17,000 or \$18,000 and have one or two children. The Government is going to send them an earned income tax credit—in some cases as high as \$1,400. And who are you taking the money from? You are taking money from people who are making \$30,000, \$35,000. The rich guy is not going to pay any more on this Btu tax than the working middle-class man or woman.

This is a canard. We should not have this tax. If you did not have this tax, you would not suffer one iota. You would help the economy. And, you would keep more money in the economy if you adopted Senator GRASSLEY's proposal. Is it so tough to say freeze, do not increase your spending?

Now we are met with the cries: Oh, you mean you will not give vaccinations, you mean you will not spend the \$300 million to expand the program? Of course we will. We would have to make the tough choices within the limits of a bill. Why would you take that program which would cast shadows upon

us and make us look like we cannot differentiate between the necessities and those which may not be nearly as important as health care and the immunization program?

My colleague from Iowa is not saying do away with that extra \$300 million for immunizations. But what we possibly could say is maybe mass transit funding would have to be reduced in order to pay for immunizations. That affects my State more than any other. That would be tough. Maybe there would be some other projects that we would have to put on the back burner as opposed to doing away with child immunization. We must make tough choices without increasing taxes on hard working families across America.

Let me tell you something. I have dubbed this budget "You Touch It and They Tax It." This chart shows the homeowner today, working middle class, husband and wife who earn \$50,000. They are not rich. They pay \$5,000 to \$6,000 in property taxes. And in addition, what do we have here? A tax on what? We tax whether it is a dishwasher, the doorbell, computer, water heater, the lawnmower, the curling iron, the hair dryer, television, microwave, power tools, snow blower—whatever it is, we tax it. That is what this budget does. Incredible.

You touch it and they tax it. They tax things that move and things that do not move. We are into a new business here. This business is, let us make another 5 million dependent people, who will get Government checks and say, "Oh, thank you, Washington." And who will pay? The poor fellow making \$30,000 or \$35,000 a year will pay for it.

I do not mind if you want to hit the millionaires, let them fight for themselves. But what does this budget do? It goes to the homeowner, whether it is Buffalo, Rochester, Iowa. Eighty percent of the homeowners in my area heat their homes with home heating oil. You double the rap on them, drive up their taxes \$500 a year, and then you use those taxes to redistribute income.

The socialists are going to a capitalistic system and we are becoming socialist. A guy makes 35,000 bucks and we are going to tax him \$3,500 more, because we decided if you make \$17,000 and you have one kid, the Government should give you money and we need to get that money from somewhere. That is where the heck we are moving. Terrific; great. That is social responsibility? Baloney. That is income distribution, and it reeks.

I think somebody has figured out we get 5 more million people getting these checks in the mail and they say, "Who gave them to us? Oh, oh, we have to vote for them." That is a reelection effort. It is incredible.

Look, help people who need help; child immunization. You mean to tell me in all the billions of dollars we

spend we cannot identify \$300 million within the budget? Why not freeze? Maybe we will not be able to do some of the things we would like to do and we will have to put good projects on hold in order to meet necessities. Would it not be nice to reduce the deficit by \$105 billion? If we are really going to take someone's money, let us make sure it goes to reducing the deficit and not new spending programs? Why drive the cost of energy up simply to go into this business of saying, oh, well, we are going to give more food stamps out, we are going to give more tax credits out, we are going to give more heating out, and we are going to pull the economy down. I did not think that is what we were about.

I find it difficult to understand our mission here. I hope it is that we will support our friend from Iowa. I do not think we are going to. I think it is going to be a straight party-line vote. I think that is unfortunate. And I think, by the way, the biggest culprits of all have been the media, in failing to correctly identify what is taking place as it relates to income distribution. They think it is funny. I think they are funny. I wonder how they can say a \$73 billion increase in energy tax when it is really a \$95 billion increase and when very little of it—when you take a look at the impact of the spending and where it is being allocated—goes to deficit reduction.

I wonder why they are so busy attempting to shield that from the public and refusing to let them really know. I understand one thing. I understand it is pretty tough to really get to that when many of my own colleagues, including this Senator, did not—until I saw page 31 of the concurrent resolution of the budget—understand how these new spending programs take place and how the money is eaten up.

I thank my friend and colleague from Iowa. I certainly hope that we can put a curb on spending. We should be curbing spending, cutting taxes, and privatizing. That is how you get this economy going; that is how you create jobs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of talk from President Clinton and those on the other side of the aisle about the need for shared sacrifice, or the nicer sounding "contributions."

Senator GRASSLEY's amendment makes a simple statement: Before the President and my Democrat colleagues ask the farmer, the shopkeeper, the nurse, the truck driver, and the senior citizen to reach into their pockets and make a contribution to deficit reduction—before the American people are asked to send more of their hard-

earned money to Washington—Senator GRASSLEY wants to make sure that every Government program takes a hit. This approach is simple; it is fair; and it reflects the emphatic message we all heard on election day from Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and Perot supporters.

With the budget that is before us today, the Democrats have made it clear that they put Government first. Republicans have a different vision for America. This approach puts business as usual out of business.

A FREEZE IS TOUGH MEDICINE

In addition to the small nondefense discretionary cuts outlined in the Sasser plan that is before us today, this amendment would apply a 1-year across-the-board freeze to all non-defense discretionary programs. Taking this step would reduce the deficit by an additional \$96 billion over 5 years.

That is tough medicine, but it is a fair and equitable remedy. These are the kinds of decisions President Clinton and the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee would have made in their plan if they were serious about reducing the deficit. They are the kinds of decisions some of us made back in 1985. They are the kinds of decisions the American people expect—and want—us to make.

But those who are forcing us to cast votes on this budget without the facts—without the legally required details—are not serious about reducing the deficit. They are only serious about getting their plan through Congress before we get a chance to find out what is in it.

PAYING FOR PRIORITIES

President Clinton and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have argued that it is time to shift priorities and increase Government spending on programs that they believe are important investments for America's future.

Do not get me wrong, many Government programs do work. Some may even deserve an increase, but the American people would be better served if these new priority investments were financed with cuts in other programs instead of tax increases. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have finally recognized that additional defense cuts cannot pay for all their pet programs. Their mistake is in assuming that the American taxpayer should make up the shortfall. We believe that the deficit should be reduced by putting Uncle Sam on a diet, not by forcing working Americans to tighten their belts.

While I would prefer to see some of the savings from Senator GRASSLEY's freeze go to reduce the record tax increases in the budget that is before us today, SENATOR GRASSLEY has decided that the savings from his amend-

ment should go to deficit reduction, and that is a goal I have always supported.

This is an amendment about fairness. It is an amendment about priorities. A vote for this amendment is a vote for responsible deficit reduction, a vote for limiting Government, a vote for the American taxpayer, and a vote for our Nation's future.

Mr. President, I am only going to take a couple minutes. I know other people on both sides have a number of commitments. We have a number of opportunities to debate the package and determine where we are going to finally come down.

I think Senator GRASSLEY's amendment make a simple statement. It is something people can understand, it is something people would support. In fact I think 24 to 28 Democrats have voted for freezes over the past few years. I assume if we all vote today and we all vote for it, it will be 73 to 20-some. So it looks like the amendment will carry unless I missed something. I probably have.

Go out and ask the farmer, the shopkeeper, the small businessman, the truck driver, the senior citizen, to reach into their pockets to make a contribution, we are now told, for deficit reduction before the people are asked to send more of their hard-earned money to Washington.

So Senator GRASSLEY wants to make certain every Government program takes a hit. This approach is simple, is fair and reflects the emphatic message we all heard on Election Day from Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and Ross Perot supporters. I just support this as an opportunity we should not pass up. This gets you, as I understand, about \$96 billion in a 1-year freeze. It seems to me that it is an opportunity we are going to have. We will have other opportunities. I think Senator GRASSLEY is right on target.

I would prefer to see some of the savings of Senator GRASSLEY's freeze go to reduce the record tax increases in the budget before us. Senator GRASSLEY decided that savings from this amendment should go to deficit reduction, and that is a goal we have all supported.

Again, I will just say for the record some of us still have scars from deficit reduction battles. We still bear the scars of the May 10, 1985, vote at 2 o'clock in the morning when we prevailed by a vote of 50 to 49, and 1 Democrat voted with us, the late Ed Zorinsky from the State of Nebraska. We did tough things. We cut spending. We did not stop anywhere. We did a lot of things people said should not be done. We did not raise taxes, but we did cut spending. That is what is lacking in President Clinton's package. I urge my colleagues—this will be a step in the right direction—to support Senator GRASSLEY's amendment. I yield back the remainder of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Senator BOND wanted time on my side. I hope he will get out here quickly because I have a few minutes left.

I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HELMS as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes and 16 seconds left. The Senator from Missouri has 2 minutes and is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Iowa. It is very simple. We have a problem: We are spending too much. We are spending more than we take in. If that happens to a family, the first thing you do is look at making cuts. You look at living within your budget. This freeze says quite simply that we are going to have to start living within our means. That is the way that you get the budget under control, not raising taxes. For every dollar that we have raised taxes around this place, we have raised spending \$1.59.

Some of my colleagues are pointing out all the wonderful programs that they say would be cut if we froze it. They are not necessarily going to be cut. There are a lot of programs that have been mentioned as being victims of these cuts that I would favor and I will support. But we have to establish a budget and live within it, establish priorities.

If we cannot establish priorities and fund things that are important, like Head Start, like programs for children, like building highways, then we do not belong in this place.

In response to President Clinton's invitation, I offered a list of \$220 billion of cuts; cutting out programs, cutting back on administrative costs of Congress and elsewhere, changing programs to make them more cost-effective. That is what we ought to be doing when we pass a budget resolution establishing a plan under which we can live and under which we can take care of the legitimate priority needs of this country.

If we are serious about reducing the deficit—and I hope that everybody understands we need to be serious about it—the best way to start is by adopting this amendment to say while we are trying to bring the deficit down, do not increase spending which increases the deficit. We have too big a deficit which leads to increased debt, which leads to inflation and, with the tax increases that are currently in this budget plan, will cost us jobs. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from Iowa. I urge support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. First of all, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names and the dates and the particular across-the-board freeze resolutions that 28 different Democrats have supported in the past years, so people will know that there are a lot of people on the other side of the aisle in support of the principle of an across-the-board freeze, and I hope, as Senator DOLE says, we get those all together so that we can in fact have a broad-based majority for a very responsible approach to bringing this deficit down.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS SUPPORTING AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD SPENDING FREEZE

Senator and legislative vehicle	Date
Baucus: ^{1,2,3}	
S.J. Res. 345, sponsor	Aug. 10, 1984.
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. 32, principal cosponsor	Jan. 5, 1985.
K-G-B-B I freeze amendment, cosponsor	May 9, 1985.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
K-G-B-B II freeze amendment, cosponsor	Dec. 10, 1987.
Biden: ^{2,3}	
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. 32, principal cosponsor	Jan. 3, 1985.
K-G-B-B I freeze amendment, cosponsor	May 9, 1985.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
K-G-B-B II freeze amendment, cosponsor	Dec. 10, 1987.
Byrd: ^{2,3}	
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Boxer: H.J. Res. 78, cosponsor	Jan. 22, 1985.
Breaux: S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Bumpers: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Conrad: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
Daschle: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
DeConcini: ² Voted for K-G-B-B I freeze	May 9, 1985.
Dodd: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Dorgan: ¹	
H.J. Res. 78, sponsor	Jan. 22, 1985.
H.R. 1965, sponsor	April 9, 1987.
H.R. 1123, sponsor	Feb. 27, 1989.
Exon: ^{2,3}	
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
Glenn: S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
Harkin: ^{2,3} Voted for K-G-B-B I freeze	May 9, 1985.
Hollings: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
Inouye: Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
Leahy: Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
Levin: ³	
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor and statement	Nov. 20, 1987.
Mitchell: ¹ His alternative fiscal year 1983 budget contained a domestic discretionary spending freeze at fiscal year 1982 levels.	June 18, 1982.
Nunn: ^{2,3} S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Pell: ² Voted for K-G-B-B freeze	May 9, 1985.
Pryor: ²	
Cosponsor, Tsongas budget freeze amendment	Oct. 5, 1984.
S. Res. 329, cosponsor	Nov. 20, 1987.
Statement supporting budget freeze	Sept. 8, 1984.
Simon: ² Voted for K-G-B-B freeze	May 9, 1985.

¹ Sponsor of an across-the-board spending freeze.

² Voted for Kassebaum-Grassley-Baucus-Biden (K-G-B-B I) freeze amendment May 9, 1985.

³ Voted against tabling the K-G-B-B II freeze amendment Dec. 10, 1987.

Note.—S. 32 is substantively the equivalent of the K-G-B-B I amendment.

S. Res. 329 is substantively the equivalent of the K-G-B-B II amendment.

Source: Congressional Record.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in closing, the President has set an example by asking all Federal employees to forgo a pay raise next year. Members of Congress have taken that same pledge. So I think we have set the stage in a bipartisan way for commanding the high moral authority that is necessary for the adoption of this across-the-board freeze of domestic programs which was adopted last night by the Democrats in the House of Representatives. If we freeze here in Washington

our own pay, the pay of Federal employees, the American people will be willing to contribute in my view by living on for a period of time what they are being appropriated now. That is why I think this amendment should be adopted, to save \$104 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee has 4 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, first I want to correct one misapprehension. The freeze that is being offered today by Senator GRASSLEY is not the same as the so-called freeze that was adopted last evening by the House of Representatives.

The Senate Budget Committee resolution, which is essentially the Clinton budget, as modified, already scales \$40 billion off of domestic discretionary spending, scales \$40 billion off the President's so-called investment package. This was done to get us below the caps that are in the Budget Enforcement Act for 1974 and 1975. It was also done to make some savings where we felt we could.

Now, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is well meaning, Mr. President, but it simply misses the mark almost entirely. If we look at where the growth in spending has occurred between the years 1991 and 1992, we find that it is not in domestic discretionary spending which my friend from Iowa is aiming at. It comes in other areas. The largest growth in this period between 1981 and 1992—and these are real increases, not nominal increases but real increases in dollars corrected for inflation. We find the largest growth is in entitlements at \$983 billion.

Now, what accounts for that? It is accounted for principally by the growth in Medicare and Medicaid costs, and Social Security. Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare account for 95 percent of the growth in entitlements. Does the amendment of my friend from Iowa affect this growth in entitlements at all? None whatsoever.

Where has been the next largest real growth in spending over the period from 1981 to 1992? It occurred during the Reagan military buildup principally in the period from 1981 through 1992. Real growth in military spending was \$679 billion. Now, this category over here entitled domestic discretionary, which represents 15 percent of the budget over the next 5 years, that is the area that my friend from Iowa wishes to impose a freeze upon. But you see that is not the problem because there has been a \$430 billion real decrease in domestic discretionary outlays in the period from 1981 to 1992.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SASSER. My time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of this amendment.

Mr. President, after the elections last November, I, like many Americans, was hopeful that we would finally end congressional gridlock and get a tough deficit reduction plan. However, in looking at this budget resolution, I am sorely disappointed.

This budget resolution is not the bold deficit reduction plan we were promised, it is business as usual. It includes the largest tax increase in history, raising taxes by over \$300 billion in the next 5 years. Rather than reduce the deficit, it even increases the deficit in the first few years. This plan can only be called one thing: tax and spend.

The plan does promise that the deficit will be reduced 3 and 4 years from now. Mr. President, have we not learned anything from the past? The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 raised taxes with the promise of deficit reduction in the future—and just look where that got us. We spent \$1.91 for every \$1 in new taxes. Yet, here we are again, increasing taxes—and on the middle class as well as those with higher incomes—and spending in the short term in exchange for promises of long-term deficit reduction. Well, Mr. President, when it comes to this latest deficit reduction plan, Utahns have a credo in common with our fellow citizens from Missouri: show me.

This economic plan claims to foster economic growth and create new jobs. Mr. President, I personally have a difficult time seeing how an economic plan based on increased taxes and spending will do either of these. By taking resources from the private sector for consumption by the Government, we are effectively choking off growth and job creation in Utah and everywhere else.

This amendment takes the first step in solving our budget crisis. It creates savings and lowers the debt. This is true deficit reduction, not a hollow promise. Only by controlling the growth of spending are we going to be able to reduce the deficit. This amendment represents a good, solid step toward controlling and reducing spending. It puts us on the path of solving the problem of our growing deficit.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand. Let's make the tough choices and show the American people that we can do something real to reduce the deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to table the Grassley amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mathews
Biden	Ford	Metzenbaum
Bingaman	Glenn	Mitchell
Boren	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Hollings	Murray
Breaux	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kassebaum	Riegle
Campbell	Kennedy	Robb
Chafee	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Krueger	Sasser
Dodd	Lautenberg	Simon
Dorgan	Leahy	Specter
Exon	Levin	Wellstone

NAYS—42

Bennett	Durenberger	McCain
Bond	Faircloth	McConnell
Brown	Gorton	Murkowski
Burns	Gramm	Nickles
Coats	Grassley	Nunn
Cochran	Gregg	Packwood
Cohen	Hatch	Pressler
Coverdell	Hatfield	Roth
Craig	Heflin	Shelby
D'Amato	Helms	Simpson
Danforth	Kempthorne	Smith
DeConcini	Kohl	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Domenici	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—4

Lott	Stevens
Mikulski	Wofford

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 184), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SASSER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the budget.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for an inquiry on my time?

Mr. LEAHY. If I could on the time of the Senator from New Mexico, yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I in no way want to deny the Senator the opportunity to speak. I thought the order of business was that the Senator from Arizona was

to be immediately recognized for an amendment. Is that not correct?

Mr. SASSER. Is that the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order provides the next amendment will be offered, not that he be recognized after the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if there has been agreement made, I was not aware of it. I certainly would not want to interfere with anybody.

Mr. DECONCINI. How long does the Senator want?

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Vermont is going to ask for 10 minutes. If I could have some time within the hour or so I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont did advise me earlier that he wished to speak for a few moments. I took that to mean 2 or 3 minutes. I inadvertently advised him that we could make time available. I have no objection, if it meets with the approval of the ranking member and Senator DECONCINI, to yield 10 minutes off the bill to my friend from Vermont at the present time.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Arizona, I understand, Mr. President, has a plane to catch. I would be happy to yield to him and take the 10 minutes later if that is OK.

Mr. SASSER. Could I yield a minute to the Senator from Arizona to get his views on the matter?

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the chairman.

I wish to catch an airplane at approximately 1 o'clock. It would be a favor to me, but I would be glad, in the meantime, after I offer the amendment and talk on it, to yield time to the Senator from New Jersey wants 5 minutes, and, if I control the time, I will yield 5 minutes on the amendment, and then I would offer to do the same for the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. This is on my time.

Mr. President, I really believe that the Senate intended that we proceed from the Grassley amendment to the DeConcini amendment to the Pressler amendment. Senator PRESSLER has a plane to catch, too, and he will not even get to offer his amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the order be that immediately following the disposition of the DeConcini time on the bill, that the next—that is what the UC says—that the next order of business will be the amendment of Senator PRESSLER.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I think that is the way to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I think the way to proceed here, if I might sug-

gest to the Chair and to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, is to proceed on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona and then, during the course of that debate, if he wishes to yield time to the Senator from Vermont, that is a matter to address to the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I did not hear the chairman.

Mr. SASSER. To recapitulate to my friend from New Mexico, what I am suggesting is that we proceed in the order as agreed upon; that is, let the Senator from Arizona lay down his amendment, speak on it, and, if during the course of the debate the Senator from Arizona chooses to yield time to the Senator from Vermont off the amendment, he is within his rights to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What does the Senator from New Mexico say?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say we are in a bind. We are putting ourselves in a situation where a Republican Senator is not going to get a chance to offer his amendment. I really believe we ought to be fair about this and use minimum amounts of time.

Mr. DECONCINI. If the Senator will yield, it is really an inquiry. Is there a time limit on the DeConcini amendment? And what is that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be a time limit once the DeConcini amendment is offered.

Mr. DECONCINI. I do not want to infringe on the time of the Senator from South Dakota, because I have the same problem. I understand we just went with a Republican amendment and now it is proper to go here. I am not going to take the full hour. The Senator wants 5 minutes, and there may be one or two other Senators. The Senator from Vermont is accommodating us within that timeframe. I would yield to him his time. And he may want to speak on this amendment because it deals with law enforcement. So that would be my intention. I do not want to mislead anybody. I do not intend to ask for additional time that is already set aside, I want to assure the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator will state it.

Mr. SASSER. There is an hour reserved on each side, is that correct, on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For every first-degree amendment an hour is reserved on each side.

If the Senator from Tennessee will yield for a moment, does the Senator from New Mexico withdraw his UC request?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that the Pressler amendment, which was scheduled to go next—and he

would not be able to be here in an hour to use—I understand they can use the hour, the two Senators who sought recognition can use it off the amendment of Senator DECONCINI. I ask it be in order that at 10:30 Monday morning Senator PRESSLER offer his amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER. I will not be back on Monday. Do it on Tuesday.

Mr. DOMENICI. 10:30 on Tuesday. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SASSER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 185

(Purpose: To ensure that fiscal year 1988 funding levels for Community Policing—Cops on the Beat—program are consistent with the levels requested by President Clinton in his investment program)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], for himself, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. WOFFORD, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 185.

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that the Community Policing ("Cops on the Beat") program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, this is not a complicated amendment. It is an amendment to just ensure in the most positive way we can that the authorizing committees and the appropriating committees will fund the community policing program that is assumed and referenced in the budget agreement before us.

Mr. President, on the streets of America there is a murder every 21 minutes, one robbery every 46 seconds, one burglary every 10 seconds, and one motor or vehicle theft every 19 seconds.

That might be an interesting conversation for a family at the breakfast table or picnic table or around the household or club. But this is a serious problem we have with crime in our streets today. We are losing control of our streets and our neighborhoods to gangs and drugs and violent crime. Americans should not have to tolerate this level of crime. Our violence is 5 times that of Canada, 10 times over

that of England, very civilized countries and good friends and we have so much in common, but we have more in common about the violent crimes on our streets. Americans should not have to tolerate a murder rate which, if unabated, will see 100,000 Americans murdered in the next 4 years. That is a lot of senseless murder and violence that is going on in our society.

The need for more police on the street is well documented. But the lack of police resources is not due to lack of recruits. Rather, the problem is that State and local governments are financially unable to hire new police officers.

Look at my own State of Arizona. In 1990, Arizona had the third highest reported crime rate in the United States. It has consistently ranked among the top five States in the last 7 years, something that, needless to say, this Senator is not proud of nor is anyone from my State.

There is approximately one police officer for each 400 residents of a city or town in Arizona. In Phoenix, the 10th largest city in the United States, approximately 2,000 officers serve a population of well over 1 million people. And in Tucson, my hometown of approximately 400,000 people, 800 officers have to serve that population. In fact, in Phoenix, the Phoenix Police Department is so strapped for resources and manpower that they are finding it increasingly difficult to even respond to the 911 emergency calls.

Mr. President, this is deeply disturbing. In recent years, several police departments have returned to the old idea of the cops on the beat, and the Senator from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is the one who has promoted this in the crime bill year after year that we passed only to see it stymied for reasons we all know.

It is a great approach that stresses the importance of the police-citizen partnership in controlling crime in our streets. But, with strapped resources and inadequate manpower, our local police cannot meet the problem.

The amendment to the budget resolution today supports President Clinton's campaign promise, his budget and his speech to the United States in reference to that budget, calling to put 100,000 police officers on the streets. It will put crime-fighting resources where every American knows they are needed most—in our neighborhoods and on our streets.

Mr. President, the amendment I am offering will ensure that funding levels for the community policing program are consistent with the \$1.7 billion requested by President Clinton in the investment program that he has put forward.

Finally, Mr. President, what is community policing? For those who may not be familiar with it, advocates of

community policing regard this approach as extremely helpful and useful because officers are free to engage more directly in the protective crime prevention professional process that they are trained to do. Operations are more visible to the public. Increased police are available to see and to respond. Citizens become partners in this effort and they improve the relations between the police and the public. Because you see the police, you know the police, they are stationed there, and you get to actually identify with them.

The Nation has to recognize the price of crime. Good schools cannot flourish where children have to worry about gangs, guns, and drugs in their classrooms. They cannot even go outside to play or participate in sports without getting beat up, somebody selling them drugs, or getting gunned down.

Profitable businesses cannot open where streets are just crowded with crime. People are not going to visit the stores. People who work there are not going to be safe. The owners are not going to be safe.

Strong families cannot be built when the neighborhoods are lost to drugs and gangs.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DECONCINI. I ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, that I may yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate, I introduced a package of bills that respond to the problems of urban America. One of those bills was the \$200 million community policing initiative that would provide matching grants to local governments and community groups to do community policing.

As the Senator from Arizona said, community policing is also part of the omnibus crime bill, and has the full support of President Clinton.

A few weeks ago, I spoke with a merchant in one of New Jersey's cities. He told me that when he calls the police—and he is only a few blocks from city hall—it takes about 3 hours for them to respond. Therefore, he has made the decision, in order to protect himself, that he is going to arm himself, and he now has several guns in his store to protect himself.

The point is that too often in America police departments measure their success only in terms of their response.

A police department will say, "Well, we are successful, because we had 1,000

911 calls and we responded to 900 of them."

But the point is not to have some kind of bureaucratic measure of police performance, but rather to determine whether the security of people who live in the neighborhoods has increased because of police performance. And that is really what community policing is all about. It attempts to involve the police much more directly with those residents who are victimized every day by crime.

People ask me, "Well, is there an analogy for this?" I draw the analogy, really, with the U.S. military and the intelligence business in the Persian Gulf war.

We were very successful in deploying military technology in the Persian Gulf war. But the key to the deployment of that military technology was intelligence—the knowledge of where to deploy it and when to deploy it.

By analogy, in urban America, police departments are frequently operating blindly.

If people in our communities are involved with the police departments, they can identify where, in the apartment and housing project, all the drugs are stored? What happens to the people on the corner when the cops come and they flee? Where do they assemble again?

There can be a much greater involvement—police walking the beat, more police available to more citizens, more direct contact; not necessarily a social worker role, but a much more accessible police officer. That is what lies behind the impetus toward community policing.

Let us make no mistake: If this succeeds, by its own definition, it will mean there will be more arrests. And if there are more arrests, the question will be: Where will we put those who are arrested?

Often in America's cities and urban areas, the jails are chock-full. So when we enter into community policing, we have to go into it with the knowledge that it might expose the need for other reforms.

And I have full confidence, if we pass a community policing bill this year, that the Clinton administration will give thorough consideration to the full implications of community policing.

I believe, if done successfully, it can increase confidence and security on the part of those who are in the midst of the turmoil of urban America today.

I would submit for the RECORD a speech given by the former commissioner of police in New York City, Lee Brown. It is entitled, "Violent Crime and Community Involvement."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprinted in Vital Speeches of the Day, Jan. 1, 1992]

VIOLENT CRIME AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT—COMMUNITY POLICING
(By Lee P. Brown, New York City Police Commissioner)

Good evening. First, I want to thank Director Sessions for convening this important conference. In doing so, he recognizes that violence is an issue of national concern. It is a problem individual police agencies cannot hope to successfully deal with alone, in isolation from one another.

In New York, the New York City Police Department and the FBI enjoy an outstanding, cooperative relationship due, in large measure, to the leadership of Assistant FBI Director Jim Fox. We have joined forces in many areas, including our Joint Task Force against drug trafficking, against organized crime, against auto larceny, and against domestic terrorism. Our joint bank robbery task force is the nation's oldest such effort—a model for the country. And the NYPD/FBI partnership in fighting organized crime has been a nightmare for the mob.

We value the relationship, and, again, welcome this conference on an issue of concern to all of us.

You have spent today, as you will tomorrow, examining many of the aspects of violence. So I won't dwell on what many of you have heard already, or will hear tomorrow. Instead, I want to touch briefly on violence, and then talk about how policing is changing; how the police need to form partnerships in the community; and how police executives need to recognize their new importance in society.

The general epidemic of violence sweeping America goes so deep, and is so pervasive as to be viewed as a disease by our leading research institutions. The Federal Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta reported, for example, that the homicide rate among black males, ages 15 to 24, rose by two thirds in the last five years. In fact, homicide is the leading cause of death among black males ages 15 to 24. Homicides account for 42 percent of all deaths in this group. And firearms are involved in 78 percent of these homicides.

The report by the Centers for Disease Control listed a number of contributing factors; namely, "immediate access to firearms, alcohol and substance abuse, drug trafficking, poverty, racial discrimination, and cultural acceptance of violent behavior."

I find it as alarming, as it is depressing, that we now track and measure homicides by age and ethnic groupings much as we tracked and measured diseases like polio or malaria.

I am no doctor of medicine. But I am a doctor of criminal justice. And I can tell you this: If the mosquito is the agent of malaria, then the illegal gun is surely the agent of homicide. Public health officials eventually learned that the way to combat malaria was not to swat mosquitoes, but to drain the swamp. And although we confiscated 17,575 illegal guns in New York City last year, we are still "swatting mosquitoes." The "swamps" are in other states where it is too easy for just anybody to buy a handgun.

We have tough gun control laws in New York. Other states don't. The way to control guns in New York is to "drain the swamps" that surround us. And that can be accomplished only through tough federal gun control. That's why I was a strong supporter of the Brady bill. That's why I support an outright ban on assault weapons, applicable to all states. And that's why I support mandatory jail sentences for gun possession.

Look again at what the Centers for Disease Control said were the factors concerning record-making homicide rates: "Immediate access to firearms, alcohol and drug abuse, drug trafficking, poverty, racial discrimination and cultural acceptance of violent behavior."

Those are issues that go beyond the borders of any city or any state. They should be addressed as part of a national agenda to combat crime and violence. I have asked President Bush to name a national commission, comprised not only of the best minds in law enforcement, but in the fields of economics, education, public health and other relevant fields.

Local police agencies can't go it alone. That's true nationally, as it is in our own back yards. I am a strong proponent of community policing. To get a handle on violence or any other serious problem in the community, the police need to build partnerships in the neighborhood. They need to use resources other than their own, be they governmental, voluntary or commercial.

Now, more than at any other time in our history the police officer is called upon to cope with the collapse of a range of social institutions—a collapse that would have seemed unimaginable to the nation's leaders of just a generation past.

Today's police officer contends with the debris of social and institutional collapse. The collapse includes the failure of primary and secondary schools in so many of the nation's urban centers. It includes the collapse of affordable health services, and affordable housing. It is marked by a dearth of residential care for people who are severely, mentally ill. The traditional family structure, the ultimate safety net, has also collapsed in many places, with more and more American households headed by single women with children, living in poverty.

Last week in Minneapolis, at the meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, one of the nation's most respected experts in child development and children's issues, Marion Wright Edelman, made an interesting observation. She said, "for too many of our poorest children, the police are the only one making a difference."

That is an important observation that no police leader should ever lose sight of.

Faced with the uncertainties and instability that stem from these social and institutional failures, the police officer's job is more demanding and complex than ever before. Clearly, in order to make a difference, the police must form working partnerships in the community, and use all the resources of government, business, the schools—all the resources available to it—to try to resolve some of the recurring problems. Otherwise, we will function only as incident responders, never getting to the root causes of crime, violence and fear.

I believe in community policing. I see it as a logical and rational use of police resources in a manner that will make a difference. We are implementing it in New York City. We are getting people in the community to help identify and solve their own problems. Community policing gives individual police officers a chance to be more creative and independent in their approach to police work. We are letting them be problem solvers. Community policing is also helping to prevent crime in the first place.

I believe the greater the complexity of our social problems, the greater the need for community policing. But I fear that some people in law enforcement and government may reach the opposite conclusion. I am con-

cerned that as crime-related problems grow in severity and complexity, there will be a temptation to revert to the superficial reassurance of the paramilitary response alone.

I predict that as urban conditions worsen, there will be mounting pressure to abandon community policing and use the police as temporary occupying forces, there to put down disturbances. We must resist such pressure. We should do just the opposite. That is, we should make the police officers permanent, highly visible fixtures in the neighborhood, known personally to the people who live and work there.

And police leaders must be more assertive about their new role. With few exceptions, you are better educated and better trained in policing and social problems than were your predecessors. Your attendance at this conference is evidence of what I am talking about.

One of the great demands for a police executive, and those under your command, is to adhere to values in the face of the collapse of values all around us. To be a police officer in urban America today is to bear witness to that collapse. We witness it in the utter disregard for human life that begins at so early an age. We witness it in the murders committed for a leather jacket or a pair of sneakers or as the result of some minor insult. That disregard for human life is a direct and very real threat to society at-large, and to police officers, in particular.

You have an important voice in determining how society addresses the threat. There are all sorts of theories behind crime and violence. Some say certain people are biologically predisposed to crime—the "born criminal" theory. Others say the social environment is the cause. Others point to lack of education, or purely economic factors.

Whatever the cause of crime and violence, one thing is certain: the police do not control the causes. We deal with the outcomes. In fact, all of us in policing should be more assertive in demanding that other leaders in the community address the problems we see on the street. They must learn that crime and violence are not police problems alone. And it is our responsibility to educate them to that fact.

You are as important in your community as any banking executive, or college president, or corporate leaders in determining how to attack the problem of violence in our communities. Perhaps more important.

But you cannot do it alone.

You should demand that the others play a role. And I would suggest that police executives, as a rule, have been lax in asserting their primacy in this regard. We have, for too long, attempted to deal with these problems in isolation. Just as community policing calls for a new role for the beat cop, it also calls for a new role for the police chief.

As important leaders in the community, you have to assert yourself, demand the respect you deserve, and get the attention you and other police professionals deserve.

It works. And it can make a difference.

Let me give you a few examples from my own experience. In Houston, I saw the increase of violence against persons—mainly among people who knew each other—the kind of violence we are seeing all over the country. The police dealt with it as far as we could. But I also went to the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, and asked what their public health professionals knew about it. What were they doing in terms of research and prevention?

The result was the creation of a Center for the Study of Interpersonal Violence at the

Texas Medical Center. That meant we put some of the best minds in the country, available right there in Houston, to work with the police. It meant we also put their research dollars to work for us.

I also went to the clergy for their help, and created the Houston Ministers Against Crime. In this way, we put the reach and the resources of the churches of Houston at the Police Department's disposal in anti-drug campaigns, youth programs and the like.

If you are not including your clergy and your educators in the fight against crime and violence, you are wasting precious resources.

As Police Commissioner in New York City, I have had the C.E.O.s of some of the world's largest corporations come down to Police Headquarters to sign a pledge to work with the police in combatting drug use. Some people thought they'd never show up. In fact, we had an overflow crowd. Under an umbrella group, called PACT, or Police and Community Together, we have the active involvement of large corporations. We held similar sessions for local and foreign press.

Using the studies by the National Centers for Disease Control, I went to our own city Health Department and suggested that it get involved. It is now viewing violence as a health issue, as is the secretary of the Federal Department of Health and Human Services.

In New York we are working with education officials, we are introducing conflict resolution training in the schools, along with our program on drug prevention and gun safety.

Another example is the United Way: The United Way regularly comes to police leaders to help with United Way fund raising campaigns. Well, we went to the United Way and said: here's the problems our cops are dealing with on the street. "What can the United Way agencies do to help?"

"United Way agencies have a certain expertise. They have experience. Tell me what you're going to do to get in there with the police to save a neighborhood?" They responded and are now part of a joint effort to use their resources with ours to address the crime problem.

You need to bring these kinds of challenges to your educators, or public health people, to voluntary and social service agencies, and to the corporate world.

You need to let the appropriate people know—yes arresting drug dealers and users is important—but so is adequate drug treatment programs.

You are the people who must articulate effective approaches to the problem of crime and violence.

You also need to help set the agenda when it comes to legislation.

For years, the National Rifle Association could sit back and count on the police leaders to be meek as a lamb when it came to gun control. Many of us are sportsmen. So the NRA figured they could count on the police to keep quiet, even as police officers were gunned down in a flood of firepower: everything from the Saturday night specials to the assault rifle were in the criminal arsenal.

But the NRA can't rely on the police to be silent any longer. The involvement of police officials in legislation favoring a waiting period for handguns is evidence of that. The same is true from pending legislation on assault rifles.

You can't afford for a moment longer to be shy about asserting yourselves.

The police are called upon to deal with increasing violence among children. But have

you demanded that the schools in your jurisdiction teach conflict resolution as a part of the curriculum in elementary schools?

The Centers for Disease Control have recognized violence as an epidemic of sorts. But has your own local Health Department?

If not, why not? Tell them it's their Police or Sheriff's Department calling, and you want their involvement. Tell them you want to meet so that the health professionals can help combat what is going down on the streets of their city or town or county.

You have to be part of the agenda-setting leadership in America, whether it is laws pertaining to guns, drugs or the exposure of children to violence on television.

On the street level, our cops have to let the law abiding public help identify the problems and define the solutions.

Among the leadership circles, you have to assert yourself and demand the participation of other community resources.

That's community policing!

And that's the way of the future.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I strongly support this amendment and I think community policing is an important initiative. It needs to be more thoroughly thought through, but it is an important development. I strongly support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DOMENICI. Did the Senator want to get the yeas and nays?

Mr. DECONCINI. Yes. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. I hope that Members will listen to what he said. He has had a long and distinguished career in law enforcement prior to coming here and he speaks on a subject he knows very well.

THE MISSION OF FOREIGN AID IN THE POST-COLD-WAR ERA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, some weeks ago I spoke at length on this floor about the urgent need for a top to bottom reform of our foreign aid program. A few days ago, I urged a major shift in funding priorities toward a bold new aid program to help Russia make the transition to democracy.

Today, I would like to offer some views on how the purposes of our foreign aid program, especially the bilateral economic assistance provided through the Agency for International Development, might be redefined. Reform essentially means redefining how foreign aid can best serve U.S. national interests in the post-cold-war era.

Over 30 years ago, President Kennedy said that the purposes of foreign aid

were to advance our national security interests and to further the cause of freedom and justice around the world. Those basic purposes remain valid today. But the way we define national security interests and what we try to achieve with foreign aid must reflect fundamentally changed international conditions and challenges.

What are our foremost national interests today, what goals should we set to further those interests, and how can we use foreign aid to achieve those goals?

Today, in the third of a series of speeches I will make during the first 100 days of the new administration on foreign aid reform, I will share my thoughts on defining new goals for foreign aid. In later speeches, I will discuss how we can achieve those goals, including streamlining and strengthening the agencies that implement our foreign aid program.

The formidable challenge we face is to design a foreign aid program that looks to the future, that the American people can support. That will not be easy. In a time of dwindling budgets and a focus on domestic needs, and of disillusionment with foreign aid as we know it, it is one thing to agree that the system needs fixing. It is quite another to agree on the remedy and to put that remedy into practice.

Our task is made all the more difficult by the fact that powerful interests have major stakes in our existing foreign aid budget. We all know those interests will fiercely resist change.

Any redefinition of foreign aid should begin with the premise that no single mission or purpose, such as containing communism, or combating poverty, will suffice. As the world has become more complex with the disappearance of the simplicities of the East-West division, so the purposes of foreign aid must be more subtle and, frankly, impossible to explain in a catchy phrase or slogan.

The starting point of any successful reform must be the establishment of a clear relationship between foreign aid and widely accepted U.S. national interests. That is the problem today. Such a clear relationship no longer exists. Reform means building a new consensus about what interests foreign aid is to serve. If we succeed in doing that, we will at last have an agreed set of goals and can design new programs and better implementation methods.

In my view, all thought of foreign aid as charity, a perpetual state of dependency by other nations upon American generosity, has no place in a renewed foreign aid program. If it is to continue much longer, foreign aid must be turned into a kind of U.S. national investment in peace, stability, growth, and justice abroad. The American people need to see that foreign aid directly serves tangible U.S. interests.

By that I do not mean to denigrate the humanitarian impulse which moti-

vates much of current U.S. foreign aid. Just the opposite. The generosity of the American people largely sustains the present foreign aid program. Polls consistently show the only form of foreign aid the American people strongly favor is that which helps people overseas, especially poor people, improve their lives.

It is precisely that kind of foreign aid that I am arguing is in the national interests of this Nation. Aid aimed at people should be the essence of a new foreign aid program.

What are the specific U.S. national interests that can be served or advanced by foreign assistance? There are many papers, studies, and reports on this question. But when all is said and done, in the international arena the United States seeks:

A healthy global environment in which natural resources are used wisely and the world's population is in balance with the ability of the Earth to sustain it;

Stable democratic, pluralistic systems with open, responsive governments in which all people participate and feel a stake;

Growing economies which can provide markets for U.S. products, and economic justice and participation for the peoples of the developing world.

Clearly, every one of these interests directly affects the quality of American life, as well as that of the peoples of the developing world. An aid program that protects the global environment, curbs runaway international population growth, promotes democracy and human rights, and stimulates sustainable economic growth with equity will advance our own national well-being. That kind of foreign aid would, in reality, be a form of U.S. national investment abroad, with measurable returns to American citizens.

That we live in an increasingly interdependent world, and that protecting our national well-being compels us to be part of a larger, global effort, has been said by many people before, but let me give a few examples to illustrate the point:

The strength of our economy depends on the strength of the world economy, but the very countries that hold the most promise as future markets for our exports are today the ones most in need of assistance of restructure and expand their economies. In the 1980's, because of unwise economic policies and poor foreign aid programs, over \$30 billion in U.S. trade with the developing world was lost. That cost the United States 600,000 jobs. And it meant even deeper misery in the developing nations whose economies stagnated or declined.

It has been estimated that every additional \$1 billion in U.S. exports creates 20,000 new jobs in the U.S. foreign aid that is aimed at promoting sustainable growth in the Third World offers a

way to stimulate rapid growth in United States export sales.

Conversely, misused or wasted foreign aid costs jobs in this country as well as abroad. When we use our scarce foreign aid dollars to prop up corrupt or incompetent governments, we cost the American taxpayer returns in growing foreign economies and more jobs here at home.

Many of these countries have been torn by war and are struggling to protect a fragile peace and rebuild their economies. Their failure to build stable political institutions and functioning, sustainable economies has meant major foreign policy problems for us. Out of the misguided policies of the 1980's came Somalia, Zaire, Liberia, and Sudan. These four nations accounted for 80 percent of United States foreign aid in sub-Saharan Africa in the 1980's, and today every one is in a state of collapse. Not only did large-scale aid from us not prevent anarchy, it actually promoted it by allowing dictators to avoid the need to build workable institutions.

Look at what our old ally, President Mobutu, has done with millions of American tax dollars he pocketed during the Reagan-Bush years, while we pursued an ill-fated policy in support of Jonas Savimbi in Angola. Today, Zaire is plundered, its people are starving, and Mobutu is holed up in his palace. In Angola, rather than accept defeat at the polls, Savimbi prefers to sacrifice what little is left of that ruined country.

Aid given to dictators, corrupt rulers, and oppressive or incompetent governments means new Zaires and Somalias, more millions wasted, and more costly interventions by United States military forces.

Our natural environment is inseparable from the global environment. The destruction of the Earth's remaining forests, most of which are located on other continents where exploding populations are destroying the natural resource base, threatens to dramatically change our own climate.

In India, a country torn by religious and civil strife, and an impoverished population that will grow by another 100 million by the end of this decade, the forests are being burned in millions of household stoves that are pouring carbon dioxide into the atmosphere we share.

If, working with the international community, we cannot stop global warming, pollution of the air and water, destruction of the world's biodiversity, and the unsustainable exploitation of the world's natural resources, our standard of living and the lives of our children and grandchildren will suffer.

There are countless other examples. But the point is inescapable. Foreign aid that responds to these kinds of challenges advances real U.S. national

security interests. It is not a giveaway, it is an investment in our Nation's future.

Before we can agree on where we go from here, we first need to understand where we are. What does our foreign aid program look like today?

Many Americans, including some elected officials, are confused about the size and content of the foreign aid program. Frequently, I am asked why, rather than send aid overseas, we do not use those dollars to reduce the deficit.

The fact is that the foreign aid appropriation—some \$14 billion in fiscal year 1993—consists of only about seven-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal budget. By comparison, this year Americans will spend one and a half times as much on cigarettes.

When most people think of foreign aid they think of AID, [the Agency for International Development]. AID's fiscal 1993 budget of \$6.5 billion funds our bilateral economic development programs, which pays for everything from cement to medicines, and supports programs as diverse as protecting wildlife in Africa to training police in Central America. But that amounts to less than half of the activities that are usually considered foreign aid. The remainder is accounted for by:

U.S. contributions to the international financial institutions, and private and international debt reduction programs administered by the Treasury Department;

Refugee assistance, voluntary contributions to the U.N. specialized agencies, international antinarcotics efforts, and international antiterrorism activities administered by the State Department;

Military assistance, grants, loans and loan guarantees, military education and training, and related programs administered by the Defense Security Assistance Agency;

Trade promotion and export assistance programs administered by the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Trade and Development Agency, and others;

The Peace Corps, and a handful of small specialized programs, such as the Inter-American Foundation and the African Development Foundation.

In addition, many other agencies have foreign aid programs funded either by transfers from AID or by direct appropriations outside the foreign operations appropriation. These include: A substantial humanitarian assistance program in the Defense Department; export promotion and technical assistance programs of the Department of Agriculture, including the Foreign Agricultural Service; the Foreign Commercial Service of the Department of Commerce; the international environmental programs of the Environmental Protection Agency; international nu-

clear safety programs of the Department of Energy; and international labor programs of the Department of Labor. The list goes on to include nearly all Cabinet departments and many sub-Cabinet agencies.

It should be obvious that any comprehensive attempt to rationalize and restructure our foreign aid program cannot be limited to reforming AID an agency which everyone agrees is in dire need of reform. Greater policy coherence and improved results from our foreign aid program will require far more effective coordination throughout the Federal Government.

While the foreign aid program, broadly defined, consists of a multitude of programs funded and administered by over 20 departments and agencies that rarely listen to each other or even bother to find out what the others are doing, AID itself is a collection of independent and uncoordinated yet often duplicative, overburdened parts. AID today consist of almost 400 organizational units that are attempting to implement over 39 separate objectives and many more earmarks and directives imposed by both Congress and the executive branch.

This kind of bilateral assistance cannot go on any longer. The mission of AID has to be clarified so that it knows what the President and Congress want it to do. Its current maze of objectives must be reduced to a clear set of broad goals which will allow it to design programs to achieve those goals.

In my next speech, I plan to go into more detail on how AID might be changed to become a more manageable, more effective, foreign aid agency. Suffice it to say here that AID, much maligned for mismanagement, waste, red-tape, and unresponsiveness, often deservedly so, has been asked to do the impossible and then savagely criticized for failure to achieve it.

A good deal has been written about how we can achieve some semblance of coordination of foreign aid throughout the Federal bureaucracy, and how we can transform AID into an efficient, effective agency. The Deputy Secretary of State has begun a study of these issues, and says he will have a proposal for the Congress to consider by the end of April. I have met with the Deputy Secretary to discuss foreign aid reform and appreciate his willingness to consult closely with the Congress during this process.

As an aside, I am disturbed by the delay in naming a new Administrator of AID. The delay has been costly to the present reform efforts. It has meant, for example, that AID had little or no input into the fiscal 1994 foreign assistance budget request—a budget that in large part will have to be defended and administered by AID. It has meant that AID has had no voice at the policy table who can speak with the authority of a White House appoint-

ment. And it has meant that AID probably the Agency most affected by the reform effort, has been essentially a passive object, not an active participant in designing its own future.

Mr. President, while any consensus on a new vision and set of goals for foreign aid will take time and compromise, I believe we can begin by reaffirming that we have a national interest in securing for others the same rights and values we cherish ourselves, and in helping to create a better future for all.

I would like to suggest some guidelines to help us through what will be a difficult process:

Congress and the executive branch must consult regularly throughout the process. Our goals must be America's goals, or we will see a repetition of the policy disputes, scandals, and loss of trust that have plagued our foreign aid program for the past decade and more. Again, I welcome the efforts Deputy Secretary Wharton has made to begin a new era of cooperation.

Foreign aid has not failed. It has many successes to its credit. In the past three decades, developing countries, as a group, have performed better economically than the wealthy countries in terms of growth rate of per capita income. Average life expectancy and adult literacy have increased sharply since 1960, and child mortality rates have halved in a generation. The green revolution, eradication of smallpox and other diseases, child immunization programs that raised coverage in developing countries from under 5 percent 25 years ago to 80 percent today, are other examples of the many successful programs the United States supported.

Foreign aid played its part in these achievements, together with the support of the aid recipients themselves.

As the world's only superpower, we have global responsibilities. We are both the biggest producer and the biggest consumer Nation. While we alone cannot solve the world's problems, neither can they be solved without us. Unless we use our enormous financial and human resources to lead other countries in a common purpose, whether it be to protect the Earth's environment or to prevent future Somalias, these goals will continue to elude us.

Our strength at home and abroad go hand in hand. Reforming foreign aid can contribute to strengthening our economic competitiveness by helping to create the conditions overseas to generate new markets for our exports. But unless our technology can compete with what the Germans and the Japanese are producing, they will be the ones who benefit from those markets, not us.

We must strive for consistency between what we say and what we do. Time and again with our mouths we preached about democracy and human

rights while with our dollars and weapons we supported dictators and oppressive regimes. The result was cynicism at home and resentment abroad.

We should focus on results, and remember that spending money should never be an end in itself. In the past, we have too often measured success by how much money we spent, rather than on what we actually accomplished with it. If we are going to convince the American people that they should continue to pay for foreign aid, they need to see they are getting their money's worth, and in a period of declining budgets it had better be more for less.

More and bigger is not always better. A persistent criticism of the foreign aid bureaucracy is that it is out of control. Piles of reports mandated by Congress that no one reads, long lists of people to sign off on even the most mundane decisions, months of delays to implement a simple directive—this is the rule, not the exception. No matter how successful we are at shifting the focus of foreign aid, unless we streamline the mechanisms that design and implement and evaluate programs, we will continue to be disappointed with the results. We need to rein in the Medusa, to simplify the decisionmaking process in every way possible.

There are no shortcuts and no magic formula. Today, millions of Americans continue to live below the poverty line. Economic growth that both reduces poverty and protects the environment for future generations—what we refer to today as sustainable development—is still a goal for our own country, not just the developing countries. Only by investing in people and in institutions can sustainable development be achieved.

We should emphasize what we do best. Increasingly, we have tried to be all things to all people. We have to choose and we have to set priorities and stick to them. Our resources are limited. Time is limited. We need to concentrate on the things we do best, and coordinate with other donors to avoid a duplication of efforts.

With these guidelines in mind, we can set out to identify the challenges that should be the focus of our foreign aid program in the years ahead.

In doing so, we should all maintain a sense of humility about the difficulty of this undertaking. It is sobering to note how accurately President Kennedy's words of over 30 years ago still apply:

While our aid programs have helped to avoid economic chaos and collapse, and assisted many nations to maintain their independence and freedom * * * many of the nations we are helping are not much nearer sustained economic growth than they were when our aid operation began. Money spent to meet crisis situations or short-term political objectives * * * has rarely moved the recipient nation toward greater economic stability.

Creating the social, political, and economic conditions for global sustain-

able development requires a strategy that can take us well into the next century. This is a challenge to leadership. For the sake of our children, we must respond.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona for his usual courtesy. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, who once again is carrying out the Herculean, and sometimes Sisyphean chore of bringing through a budget resolution. Like Sisyphus, he will persist. But, unlike Sisyphus, I predict that he will succeed.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his kind words. I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeCONCINI].

The DeConcini amendment supports additional investment in the Community Policing Program as envisioned by President Clinton.

What is the community policing initiative all about? The community policing initiative provides unique and very needed approaches to addressing the very serious problem of criminality in our Nation's cities.

I am sorry to say—and I am ashamed to say, really—that crime in our Nation's cities has gotten out of control. We pick up the newspapers here in Washington, DC, and we hear stories of innocent bystanders being taken victim by carjackers. We all remember the horrible story of a young mother with her baby who had her car carjacked in the suburbs of Washington. The carjackers threw the baby out the window and the young mother was left to dangle out the door on a seat belt until she was fatally injured as she brushed against an automobile as the carjackers sped away.

We hear stories of youngsters carrying pistols into schools, committing crimes. I think it is a sad commentary on the times that we live in that metal detectors are necessary in many of the public schools in certain urban areas of this country. Too often we hear stories of people who fear going out in their communities because of violence. Let us face the facts. Criminality and criminal conduct have become part of the culture in certain areas of this country.

It is not going to be easy to deal with this problem. It needs to be approached in a lot of ways. One is to provide proper education, job training, opportunity for young people as they grow from children into adolescents and then into

adulthood. That is the way to deal with the new generation coming on. But I think we have to face the unhappy fact that some in the older generation now are simply incorrigible and they are going to have to be dealt with by more widespread and more pervasive law enforcement.

We hate to admit it, but it is a fact: Our Nation has become so violent that the United States of America is the most violent Nation on the face of the Earth. The United States of America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, has the highest murder rate of any country in the world.

In this country, the United States, we have more rapes than any country in the world. We may have been surpassed in recent months in some areas of Bosnia. But year in and year out, there are more rapes in the United States than any other country in the world.

We have the highest rate of theft, and what is sad about it is no other nation even comes close to what is happening in this country. We have more murders, more premeditated cold-blooded murders in the capital city, Washington, DC, a city of approximately 500,000 people, than they have in all of South Africa, a nation of 26 million people. What does that say about the violence and the criminality that is embedded in the culture in the Nation's Capital?

We have looked the other way for too long with this problem. We have had a lot of rhetoric and not much action coming out of the administrations for the past 12 years that have occupied the executive branch of this Government. But fortunately for all of us, President Clinton has recognized the need to address the very severe crime problem in this Nation.

His community policing initiative is only one component of a comprehensive anticrime initiative. Also included in the President's crime initiative is a police corps program, and what this police corps program will do is to provide college scholarships to young people. In exchange, they would serve as police officers for a certain period of time to pay the Government back for their college scholarships.

One of the problems that local police forces have been having in recent years in hiring and retaining policemen is the escalating cost of police force fringe benefits, driven primarily by health care costs. With these young police officers coming in, serving 2 to 4 years in their police forces, many times engaging in conduct that will be less hazardous for police officers, the cost to the cities of these young police officers will be greatly reduced.

It is also felt that many of these young college educated individuals who move into the police force to pay for their college education, doing police work in exchange for the Government

helping them get through college, will find police work to their liking and they will stay in the police forces around this country and will upgrade the caliber of police officers. More police officers will have college degrees. More police officers will know about things like sociology, psychology, criminology. They will be better able to police our streets and enforce law and order in this country.

Also included in President Clinton's program is a criminal records upgrade program to assist the various 50 States in improving their criminal records infrastructure link with the criminal information database maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation so that they can more quickly identify individuals or the profiles of individuals who might be in their States committing criminal acts.

It will also, of course, have increased funds to meet the costs associated with detaining and incarcerating the growing Federal prison population; more money to put people in prison who committed criminal acts and to keep them there.

The community policing initiative is a necessary component of the President's overall crime package. Alliances between community residents and the police are essential for making neighborhoods safe and drug free. The President's community policing initiative will focus on activities that bring the police together with the people who live in the community to build relationships of trust and to promote security. We find many times that the people in neighborhoods that are being terrorized by hoodlums and drug dealers and murderers really are afraid to talk to the police. They are not sure they can trust the police, and they are afraid that somehow if they try to cooperate with the police that the criminals will find out about it and punish them.

This President's community policing initiative will work to build relationships of trust between the police officers and those they seek to protect. It will do so by utilizing techniques that we have gotten away from and we need to have more of, like policemen walking the beats, policemen on foot walking through the neighborhoods so that the people can see them and, more important, the criminals can see them, and they will be more than just a car whizzing down the street that is here one second and gone the next. They will be real people in real police uniforms with real badges with real pistols on the belt who will be there to protect the people and the people can see them and talk to them and get to know them. More important, they can get to know the people and get to know what is happening in that neighborhood and develop sources of information in that neighborhood, and get to know who the good guys are and who the bad guys are

and, in that way, more effectively protect the people in the neighborhood and enforce the law.

The President's program provides for citizen neighborhood watches to inform the police, to inform the officer walking on the beat what is going on. It also calls for targeted mobile police units to come in and aid that foot patrolman when he or she needs help. These mobile police units will work to increase positive interaction between the citizens and the police.

President Clinton's economic plan includes \$1.1 billion for community policing initiatives through 1998. The President's community policing initiative is desperately needed.

We need to get more policemen on the streets walking up and down those beats, talking to the people, finding out what is going on. We need to have more mobile police units that can get there in a split second to back them up when they have to enforce the law. We need to have better intercommunication between the criminal records maintained by State governments and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and President Clinton's program provides for that.

His program provides for an infusion of idealistic college educated young people in the police forces across the Nation. These young people can bring with them the skills and the idealism that only youth have, to bring new intellect to the police forces and to set a better example for the young people in the urban neighborhoods they will police.

All this is part of this President's program, his economic program, his program to revitalize this country. It is in this young President's budget, and we need to support it.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have spent a lot of time in the last 2 days talking about the President's program, trying to pick it apart, saying he wants to just raise too much money to do too many things. If we listen to some of them and we carried out the budget cuts they have been proposing, to borrow a phrase from my distinguished friend, Congressman MARTIN SABO over on the House side, they would have us traveling on gravel roads again. We would not be traveling on superhighways. We would not have the funding for air traffic control; the air transportation system would continue to deteriorate. We would not have the funding for things like this community police initiative which is so desperately needed to bring security to our citizens. It is a basic function of government, a fundamental function of government that it should make its citizens free of fear in their homes and in their places of work, to protect their property and to protect their lives. And any government that does not do that is failing in the fundamental duties to which government should be dedicated.

Our Government is failing in that now, and President Clinton's police initiative will go a long way towards saying that these goals are fulfilled.

Mr. President, I might ask how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 23 minutes 13 seconds remaining on the amendment.

Mr. SASSER. I see the distinguished Senator from Illinois has arrived on the floor. I would inquire of her if she wishes to speak.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I do.

Mr. SASSER. I yield the Senator from Illinois 10 minutes of the time controlled by the proponents of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair.

I rise to talk a little bit about the importance of this initiative, community policing. It is long overdue. It is an idea whose time is now. Quite frankly, community policing really takes us back to an old fashioned idea we talked about, about the beat cops and the police on the street. It is most importantly, however, Mr. President, an effective crime prevention strategy. It worked before to make our communities safe. It can work now to make our communities safe.

Senator SASSER, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, talked about the importance of having law enforcement officials as part of the community, to get to know the people, to be there before the fact, before crime has happened. This is a formula that has worked in time past in our country. We got away from it and the result was that people in communities throughout this Nation have been victimized more and more and more from the absence of community policing.

I would like to bring your attention, Mr. President, to an article that appeared just this morning in the New York Times which talked about "Crime Down in New York for Second Year in a Row," and part of that article, and I think it is pertinent to this debate, talks about one of the reasons for the decline in crime. It says:

Police department officials and some criminal justice experts also gave some of the credit to the addition of 3,000 officers to the force since the fall of 1990 from 25,000 uniformed officers to 28,000 and a further strengthening of community policing in the city's diverse neighborhoods where beat officers have been trying to resolve problems in partnership with their residents.

Well, Mr. President, this proactive approach to law enforcement makes sense. It has worked before. It can work again. We just simply have to give the President's program support.

For the last several years we have really approached law enforcement backward. It has all been after the fact. It has all been reactive and we have

paid and paid again for our failure to understand that effective crime prevention saves money in many different ways. It saves money because we are not just using our tax dollars to buy sophisticated equipment that the local law enforcement community does not have access to. It saves money because we do not bear the costs of the victimization. All the people who are victims of violent crime particularly pay in human terms in enumerable amounts of suffering, not to mention financial loss. Again, we pay for our failure to understand that if you prevent crime as opposed to just reacting to it you save money, you save the taxpayers.

It also will save money because right now average citizens, taxpayers are paying for the incarceration of criminal offenders after the fact at a rate that averages out, Mr. President, at about \$20,000 a year per person. So we have a huge jail population. We have the largest jail population, in fact, in the world at this point, per capita. And we are doing that because our approach has been reactive instead of proactive, instead of being preventive.

This community policing initiative seeks to give us the capacity to prevent crime before it happens, to stop crime before it happens, to give communities the ability to deal with community problems before law-abiding citizens become victims.

Mr. President, I come from a law enforcement background. My father was a police officer, my uncle a police officer, my only brother is a homicide detective in Chicago. I grew up in a family in which respect for the law was important, and I know there are many law-abiding citizens out there who believe we can only achieve domestic security if we are safe to walk home. People right now live in terror of what is going on in the streets, and we seem to have turned our backs on those people. We have said to them it is OK to let crime happen; we will just let it go on; we are just going to turn our back, ignore it, maybe it will go away. And the crime hurts the innocent, the victimization happens, and the taxpayer still winds up paying as our only response has been to lock people up and throw away the key. That has not worked. Everybody knows it has not worked, Mr. President.

The essence of community policing is its belief that only when a police force and the community it protects work hand in hand can we really make people feel safe in their homes and on our streets. Who knows better what threatens the safety and well-being of a particular neighborhood than the community residents themselves? And who is better prepared to deal with those threats than a local police force that has been truly integrated into the community? But for too long, Mr. President, we have believed that the best way to deploy our police was to use po-

lice officers almost as judicial firefighters who would rush from crime scene to crime scene to put out the latest blaze of violence. Our focus has been on arrest rates and response times.

The community policing approach turns that misguided philosophy on its head, Mr. President. It is built upon the irrefutable premise that if you can prevent a crime before it starts, you need not focus on response times because no response will be necessary at all.

So going back to the basics, going back to community policing as a response, to put more police on the streets where it can make a difference we will begin to protect our communities, protect our citizens, and in the long run will save taxpayers' dollars. The \$1.7 billion that the President is suggesting is the best money we can spend to restore our domestic security and begin to provide the local communities with the kind of help and support they need in order to beef up community police, again, the police on the beat give communities the capacity to deal with the rising crime and the rising victimization.

I think this approach, Mr. President, commends itself to all of us. It is an effective crime prevention strategy. It is turning away from the failed approach of locking the barn door after the horse is out, putting people in jail after the crime is committed, letting people be victims. It says that we in the Senate understand the President's approach to providing our people with some security where they live. We understand that most Americans want to live in secure communities. We understand that law enforcement at the local level is what matters the most. It does not serve our interest to pay for a court system, to pay for a jail system, to pay for sophisticated machinery and studies when the people who are actually on the frontline are not getting any help from us.

Mr. President, I can tell you that it has been my experience, both coming from a law enforcement family and, indeed, as a prosecutor, that an ounce of prevention really is a pound of cure in this instance. And an ounce of prevention will give us the ability to get our communities back, to make our streets safe again, to keep women—particularly—from being victims, afraid to go home.

We can begin to put our resources where it can do the most good. That makes government work better. That makes government more efficient. That is effective kind of prevention strategies that ought to be supported.

I urge our colleagues, Mr. President, on the other side of the aisle to support this initiative. They have been talking about law and order all these years and, all it seems they meant was law in some abstract sense and order may be

out in the middle of the cornfield as opposed to somewhere where we need it the most. We need it in these communities, where community police can make a difference. We need it to stop people from being victims. If they are serious about law and order they will get behind the initiative and support it.

This is a proactive approach. Support the initiative and its preventive approach. I urge our colleagues to support community policing as an idea not only whose time has come but as an idea that has proved itself time and time again. That is our history and our experience.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished chairman that we want time charged equally. So we are not going to have a quorum call. We will go talk and we will leave it out of a quorum call and charge it equally. Is that what we do when we do not ask for one?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I would suggest to put it into a quorum call and charge it equally on both sides.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent the time be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am going to speak for 2 minutes and then yield back any time I have. I understand they are going to yield back any time they have on the DeConcini amendment. Then we will go on to the Wellstone amendment.

I have a statement I want to make with reference to the DeConcini amendment.

Madam President, this amendment sets assumptions in the Senate that President Clinton's community policing/cops on the beat initiative be fully funded for fiscal year 1998.

According to CBO, the President's proposal would cost \$50 million in budget authority and \$11 million in outlays in 1994. Over 5 years, this ini-

tiative would require funding of \$1.1 billion in budget authority and \$720 million in outlays.

This is a new grant program to localities that aims to make our streets safe again by putting 100,000 new police officers back on the streets and expanding community policing, "Putting People First" pages 114, 56, and 50.

I support the idea of a street-level attack on crime and the intentions of the Senator from Arizona are admirable. However, the adoption of this amendment will not necessarily ensure funding for the President's new program.

It is difficult to lock in spending for any of the President's new programs before the authorizing committees review the merits of this idea, create the program, and authorize the funding.

Madam President, I applaud the Senator for his attempt to make it clear to the American people that crime is a critical national, as well as local, issue.

I just want to make two points. First of all, it seems to me that we are now getting into a very, very serious and dangerous habit regarding the budget resolution. This proposal would be out of order, according to an exchange we had this morning with the Parliamentarian, unless it was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution and yet it reads like it is not.

So I am going to call it a sense-of-the-Senate resolution and just tell the Senate what we are doing. We are putting before us a budget resolution that is nonbinding as to anything. It has a lot of assumptions in it, and now we are going to come along and offer a very precise amendment and say it is not specific but we all want you to vote to tell the appropriators that you want this funded fully.

We could go through every item on the budget, if we had enough time, and vote on our sense when we know it is not binding and when we know it cannot be done, there is not enough to go round.

Having said that, I merely want to say that the amendment is also drawn off the President's putting people first book, and Chairman SASSER's amendment has already changed putting people first dramatically, and what you have done is you put off the funding for this program until 1997 but the amendment is still numbered by the dollars off of the President's putting people first.

I do not have any objection to that. It is just that these numbers that we are voting on do not apply anymore, because the distinguished chairman, to get more savings, assumed that these programs were going to be put off for 3 years.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator DECONCINI's community policing amendment.

Burglary, theft, rape, family violence, child abuse, murder, drug abuse,

these are words we do not like to hear, and yet we hear them daily. We hear them daily because crime is so pervasive in our communities and neighborhoods that there is no escape. Regardless of your income, race, gender, or age, you could be a victim of a crime.

That is a national disgrace. I cringe to think that this is the America other countries call the land of hope. Our crime rate redefines what we mean when we call America the land of hope. Hope for what? Hope not to be assaulted? America should not have to tolerate crime, and we will not have to if we give community policing the support it needs to work.

Community policing puts more law enforcement officers on the streets and in our neighborhoods so that we can stop crimes before they happen. Community policing also focuses on assigning the same officers to the same neighborhoods so that a unity builds between law enforcement and citizens. That unity helps to fight crime because the officers are more in touch with the problem and can work with the community members to kill the problem at the root. Each community has its own crime problems and a case-by-case remedy has been proved to be more effective for fighting crime than the current system which is a blanket, city-wide approach.

In Texas, community policing has been very successful in Dallas and Austin. The Dallas Police Department and the Austin Police Department find that crime is reduced where community policing is applied—particularly effective when fighting the drug war. The officers target the pushers and work to identify problems that social services can address so that the quality of life is improved. Improving the quality of life helps to eliminate the criminal element.

The Austin Police Department has benefited so greatly from community policing since they started 2 years ago that they consider it a concept rather than a program. Since January 1992, Austin's crime rate dropped 15 percent. Moreover, the Austin Police Department is below the national average of officers per persons compared to other like cities, and they still managed to reduce crime with the help of this concept. Austin has been able to wipe out crack houses in neighborhoods, contain gang problems, and control graffiti by using community policing.

Although both cities have been successful fighting crime by using community policing, Dallas does not have the resources to apply the concept department wide. If we could reduce crime in every city by 15 percent, that would make the investment worthwhile. I think we should make the investment and provide the funds necessary to ensure that all States, cities, and towns can implement community policing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am prepared to go to the Wellstone amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. First of all, let me thank the Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. EXON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment number 186.

At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that any increase in revenues set forth in this resolution do not assume an energy tax or fee on nonconventional fuels, including solar, geothermal, wind, and biomass-derived fuels (including biomass-derived ethanol and methanol).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, first of all, I offer this amendment to the budget resolution on behalf of myself, Senators HARKIN, PRESSLER, GRASSLEY; the distinguished Presiding Officer, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN; Senators EXON, SIMON, KERREY, and BAUCUS.

Let me also add, on the basis of discussions I have had with Senators, really, on both sides of the aisle, I believe that there will be widespread support for this amendment.

Again, to just reiterate one more time the language of the amendment.

It is the sense of the Senate that any increase in revenues set forth in this resolution do not assume an energy tax or fee on nonconventional fuels, including solar, geothermal, wind, and biomass-derived fuels (including biomass-derived ethanol and methanol).

Madam President, I have been a supporter since day one for the basic parameters of President Clinton's economic plan, including his proposal for a broad-based energy tax, and I continue to support both.

My intention here today is to address an error in the administration's draft proposal for how an energy tax will be implemented. That is really what we are talking about. The administration's proposal for a Btu tax would "exempt nonconventional fuels, including solar, geothermal, biomass and wind."

Madam President, this is entirely proper. While an energy tax's main purpose is to raise revenue to deal with the deficit, the administration has also listed some good nonrevenue reasons why it would raise money in such a way as to exempt certain sources of energy; namely, those that are nonconventional, with a focus on renewal. That is appropriate from the point of

view of our economy, the environment, and for some other public policy reasons which I will mention in a moment.

These have to do with energy competitiveness. These have to do with economic competitiveness. They have to do with national security. They have to do with the environment. They are some really important public policy reasons.

At the same time that the administration's draft plan for an energy tax exempts the nonconventional fuels that I just mentioned, the proposal also explicitly includes biomass-derived ethanol and methanol among the fuels that would be subject to tax. That is in the draft proposal. This is a clear inconsistency with no policy justification.

I would like to read for a moment from an OMB document talking about the objectives of the energy tax part.

Increase energy efficiency of economy for long-run competitive advantage;

Improve environment through reduced growth of fossil fuel consumption and modest incentives favoring cleaner fuels;

Enhance national security and U.S. trade balance by reducing oil imports;

Strengthen economic performance through vigorous deficit reduction, boosting long-term U.S. investment, productivity and growth and encouraging U.S. exports.

Ethanol is a biomass fuel. It is a nonconventional biomass fuel. It is a nonconventional source of energy. It is not a fossil fuel. It is a biomass fuel. It is a successful domestically produced renewable and, most important, it fits the very nonrevenue objectives of the energy tax that have been set out by the administration itself.

That is the reason I offer this sense-of-the-Senate amendment today to the budget resolution.

Ethanol helps increase, not decrease, energy efficiency for our Nation's economy and, therefore, it contributes to the economic competitiveness of our country.

The Washington Post had a piece the other day which indicated that, in fact, we are yet importing more oil, which is a serious problem from the point of view of our environment.

If we are to be serious, Madam President, about the problem of global climate change, we are going to have to make a connection between how we produce and consume energy and the protection of that environment for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren.

Ethanol biomass, a particularly clean fuel, is not fossil fuel. Ethanol helps improve the environment through reduced reliance on fossil fuel consumption in favor of cleaner fuel, and ethanol enhances national security and the U.S. trade balance by decreasing—reducing—oil imports.

As we all know, Madam President—you certainly do, coming from the State of Illinois, and other Senators who come from agriculture States; I

am sure the Senator from Michigan knows this well, too, coming from the Midwest—ethanol also provides additional markets for our agriculture producers, which contributes to a healthier rural economy.

And, Madam President, we certainly cannot underestimate the difficulties that people in rural America face.

Senator RIEGLE, from the State of Michigan, has been on this floor many, many times. I have presided quite often while he has spoken. Over, and over, and over again, he talks about bread and butter economic issues. He talks about jobs. He talks about health care. He talks about child care. He talks about the economies of local communities. He talks about the importance of opportunity, real opportunity, for people. He talks about hope. He talks about the need to invest in our economy. He talks about the importance of beginning to redefine national security as a security of our local communities where, again, there is gainful employment. I do not just mean jobs. I mean jobs that people can count on with decent wages and with decent fringe benefits.

I want to suggest today on the floor of the U.S. Senate that all these bread and butter economic issues are every bit as important in rural America as in urban America. The economic pain, and sometimes the poverty, may be more hidden but it is no less real in rural America.

So, Madam President, I have said from the beginning that I support the President's plan. I have been out front in supporting it in the State of Minnesota and will continue to do so.

I am pleased to see that we finally moved away from smoke and mirrors. I think there is so much support for the President's proposal that people feel as if it represents some change. People see that there is a focus on bringing the deficit down.

But as, again, the Senator from Michigan knows, and the distinguished Presiding Officer knows, we had, I thought, a fine meeting with the President yesterday in which we emphasized to the President: Yes, deficit reduction, but let us keep our eye on the prize. And part of that prize, a big part of that prize, is in the economy that produces jobs for people.

We have to invest in our economy. We have to invest in ourselves. We have to invest in people in our communities.

Madam President, it is in this spirit that I offer this amendment. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of ethanol as a biomass fuel, clean fuel. It is a part of the future for our country that we focus on renewables. It is important to Agriculture, important to rural America, and, I say to the Senator from Michigan, Senator RIEGLE, important to job creation.

Madam President, I think, really, we are at a point in time where we are try-

ing to think about economic development models, where the entrepreneurship, the actual decisionmaking, the actual investment of capital and, therefore, the actual benefitting, actually happens at the community level.

There is enormous potential for ethanol in this respect. And it is in this spirit that I introduce this amendment and I remain very confident that when we vote on Tuesday, the Senate will deliver a really strong message to the people in our country. And that message is: Rural America counts. That message is to agriculture, and farmers: You are not out of sight out of mind. And that message is going to be: We are serious about an energy policy that in part—and I think the larger the part the better—focuses on saved energy, efficient energy use, and renewables.

It is vitally important, and I will just read this one more time, that we go on record that it is the sense of the Senate that any increase in revenues set forth in this resolution do not assume an energy tax or fee on nonconventional fuels including solar, geothermal, wind and biomass-derived fuels including biomass-derived ethanol and methanol.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, this amendment is very basic. It just corrects an inequity in the original tax package that came over from Treasury. The President's plan places a broad tax on energy production based on Btu or energy content. In addition to raising revenue, this Btu tax has several goals: The Btu tax seeks to reduce pollution by encouraging energy conservation. The Btu tax seeks to cut greenhouse gas emissions. The Btu tax seeks to reduce our dependence on imported oil. And the Btu tax is structured to move our Nation toward alternative, cleaner burning fuels.

To promote these objectives, the Btu tax quite properly excludes renewable or nonconventional energy derived from solar, wind, and biomass. But ethanol, which is clearly a biomass fuel, was not covered by this nonconventional fuel category. This special treatment for biomass-derived ethanol makes no sense.

Ethanol fuel meets all four criteria for the Btu tax exclusion: Ethanol reduces pollution, and has been used successfully for years in cities such as Denver, Albuquerque, and Phoenix to reduce carbon monoxide, the main ingredient of winter smog in many cities. Ethanol reduces our dependence on imported oil, by substituting a clearly home-grown product. Ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions, since the crops absorb as much carbon dioxide during the growing season as the ethanol releases during combustion. And ethanol is an alternative fuel, and obviously moves us closer to our goal of alternative, cleaner burning fuels.

Madam President, if it smells like a renewable fuel, tastes like a renewable fuel, and feels like a renewable fuel, it

must be a renewable fuel. Ethanol is a renewable fuel, and deserves the same tax exclusion as solar, wind, and other biomass fuels.

I urge adoption of the Wellstone-Harkin ethanol amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, last week I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, a sense of the Congress resolution which states that ethanol and other biomass fuels should be exempt from any new energy tax enacted during the 103d Congress. Since then, I have worked closely with the Senators from Minnesota and Iowa, Senator WELLSTONE and Senator HARKIN, in a bipartisan effort to ensure that ethanol receives the same exemption as other exempted biomass-derived fuels.

Taxing ethanol while excluding other renewable fuels simply does not make sense. Ethanol is one of the cleanest burning fuels available and our most successful renewable fuel. Ethanol helps reduce carbon monoxide, toxins, and greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. There is no more environmentally friendly fuel in use today. Additional taxes on ethanol would discourage its use.

We must develop policies that encourage and promote greater use of domestically produced renewable fuels. There is a great public demand for alternative fuels such as ethanol to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. Use of these fuels will lead to a cleaner environment. Ethanol has become one of the most valuable additives to boost gasoline octane and reduce automobile air pollution.

For weeks, many have said that ethanol was not included in the proposed energy tax. Yet, when exemptions to the Btu tax were identified by the Treasury Department, ethanol was never mentioned. Just last week many were saying ethanol was not going to be subject to the Btu tax. Last week, it was uncertain what the administration would do regarding ethanol. I felt then the best way to help the administration reach a decision was to demonstrate congressional support for exempting ethanol.

That was the reason I introduced my legislation last week. Today, it is now explicitly clear that the administration wants to tax biomass-derived ethanol. This is wrong. That is why my colleagues and I are introducing this amendment.

Subjecting ethanol to the proposed Btu tax while excluding other renewable fuels is not good policy. We must not discourage the production and use of ethanol. We should encourage it.

Farmers and ranchers in South Dakota are extremely worried over the proposed Btu tax. In fact, the proposed tax could result in fewer farmers and ranchers in my State. If there are to be new energy taxes, we must improve what is being proposed. Excluding eth-

anol from the Btu tax is a necessary improvement. Many South Dakotans have contacted me on this and our farmers and ranchers are closely watching this debate. There are clear partisan differences in this budget resolution. However, this amendment has strong bipartisan support. I thank my colleagues from Minnesota and Iowa for their leadership in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that several South Dakota editorials in support of an ethanol exemption be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mitchell Daily Republic, Mar. 2, 1993]

ETHANOL SHOULDN'T HAVE ENERGY TAX

Well, Mr. Clinton, you messed up on this one.

The president's proposed energy tax, as of last word, would not exempt ethanol.

Big mistake.

Those of us here in the Corn Belt—where the tall corn grows that's used for the production of ethanol—don't understand Clinton's rationale.

The point of the energy tax, number one, is to reduce the deficit. We agree with that. However, we don't understand why the president would tax a renewable resource.

One of the reasons for such an outstanding deficit is all of the money that goes to the purchase of foreign oils. Why tax a home-grown fuel that would decrease our dependence on foreign oil?

Corn-based ethanol is a resource that we can grow at home forever. It's better for the environment. We don't need to rely on foreign goods that pollute the air and water.

And, at a time when public awareness and the use of ethanol is increasing, an additional tax isn't needed—especially on a cleaner burning, renewable fuel.

We have to agree with Jim Peeples of Information Resources Inc., which supports ethanol use. He said, "If this becomes the final part of the proposal, I think the president is going to find himself needlessly picking a fight."

Our boxing gloves are on the shelf and ready to go, if need be.

[From the Mitchell Daily Republic, Mar. 2, 1993]

SHOULD ETHANOL BE INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED ENERGY TAX?

"No. The energy tax is to develop funds and encourage people to be energy savers and to cut down. Ethanol already is doing that. Ethanol is energy efficient. By its linkage as a fuel, it's being unfairly taxed."—Dina Brandt, executive director, Lake Francis Case Development Corporation, Chamberlain.

"Absolutely not. The energy tax is set up to address the financial problems afflicting us like the trade deficit and the national debt. Ethanol, if anything, has played a part to help the economy—to penalize it would have a negative effect. It's basically been our country's reliance on imported petroleum products that's gotten us into this mess. If anything, ethanol should be rewarded and exempted."—Trevor Guthmiller, marketing development director, South Dakota Corn Utilization Council, Sioux Falls.

"From the standpoint of ethanol producers, virtually all forms of renewable energy are exempted. We'd like to see ethanol get the same advantages in the marketplace. Our company feels ethanol should not be included in the tax because of the way it's made and because of its advantages as a domestically produced fuel. A non-clean burning, imported fuel should not be taxed at the same rate as a domestically-produced, clean burning fuel."—Jeff Broin, general manager, Broin Enterprises Incorporated, Scotland.

[From the Aberdeen American News, Mar. 17, 1993]

GIVE ETHANOL INDUSTRY A CHANCE TO PROVE ITS MERITS

Up here in the north country, the corn is rarely as high as an elephant's eye. Long winters and a relatively short growing season limit our bragging rights to somewhere around tusk region. Nevertheless, corn production is a key element in South Dakota agriculture—especially since the advent of the ethanol industry.

The corn-alcohol fuel has boosted corn prices some 20 percent to 40 percent and the ethanol industry has created jobs here and in neighboring states. It's to our advantage to keep up the momentum.

But trouble looms. Within the next 90 days or so, the Environmental Protection Agency is expected to decide whether ethanol meets Clean Air Act guidelines in the nation's smoggiest cities. Ethanol proponents also maintain their fuel should qualify for an exemption from the president's proposed new energy taxes as a renewable domestic fuel.

A clean-burning fuel, ethanol reduces carbon monoxide pollution. But ethanol blends evaporate more rapidly than ordinary gasoline and increase ozone formation.

According to the ethanol industry, that is offset by the fuel's reduction of carbon monoxide emissions, which also contribute to ozone.

While oil companies and environmentalists maintain that ethanol should be barred from the worst ozone-polluted cities, industry officials say there are sufficient studies to show that their fuel doesn't worsen smog pollution.

Point, counterpoint. Too many questions, not enough facts.

Which is a sure sign that it's too soon to abandon ethanol. If the president and EPA will give it a chance, corn may yet power another giant industry.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that time on the quorum call be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to have time in support of the Wellstone amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. If the Senator will yield, let me inquire how much time presently exists on the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan controls 45 minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. How much time does the Senator from Iowa wish to have?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would like to have about 6 minutes, if I could?

Mr. RIEGLE. Let me yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I may not use all of that but I am glad to have it. I thank my friend for doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am very pleased to be a cosponsor and to join my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, in offering this amendment. I think it is really kind of a shame that he has to go to the trouble of offering this amendment, from the standpoint of common sense, as well as from the standpoint of what the statute says about ethanol. It is a shame, as I said, that this amendment even has to be offered and that we have to fight this battle.

I think it would be very difficult for President Clinton, or people who work for him, to say that ethanol is not a biomass energy and to argue instead that it is a conventional fuel. If they are having any difficulty in understanding what biomass is, I think it is very clear in the definitions within title XLII, section 8802 of our United States Code. This section defines:

The term "alcohol" means alcohol (including methanol and ethanol) which is produced from biomass.

Then it goes on to define the term "biomass" meaning—

*** any organic matter which is available on a renewable basis, including agricultural crop and agricultural wastes and residues.

The term "biomass fuel" means any gaseous, liquid or solid fuel produced by conversion of biomass.

If that is not clear enough, then there is title XXVI, section 29 which states:

The term "biomass" means any organic material other than (A) oil and natural gas (or any product thereof) and (B) coal (including lignite) or any product thereof.

So, Madam President, I happen to believe that we in this body are going to make clear that ethanol should be guaranteed an exemption from the Btu tax in the very same way as we thought originally on hearing comments from the administration on the budget that the Btu tax was to be exempted and later finding out that maybe it was not. Consequently, several of us, under the leadership of Senator WELLSTONE, have put in this amendment.

I want to suggest and I cannot with absolute certainty say the situation is exactly the same in President Clinton's administration as was in President Bush's administration. I can tell you from some battles that we Republicans had with our own administration just

last year on the subject of ethanol, we found too often odd forces between environmentalists, on the one hand, working with big oil, on the other hand, to prevent a proethanol regulation to be written under the clean air bill.

There might be some of this that carries over into this administration as well. I hope not, but some evidence of this came out yesterday in a little bulletin called Ag Commodities News and Views, and I want to quote:

Vice President Al Gore is said to be "strenuously working against efforts to exempt ethanol from President Clinton's proposed Btu tax," says one source.

A source very familiar with the meetings on this issue says that Gore is, "dead set against any exemption for ethanol."

Madam President, this is somewhat of a surprise because we all remember that we had the very good help of then Senator GORE to help us promote ethanol. I kind of wonder what has happened between serving in the Senate on this issue and his attitude now on ethanol, now that he is Vice President.

I hope it is not the same as what was present in the previous Republican administration because it is an awful big battle to overcome. We all know that there is competition between MTBE, as one oxygenated fuel, versus ethanol, as an alternative fuel under the clean air bill.

Certainly such a tax, if it were on ethanol, would assure that MTBE monopolizes our reformulated fuels program pushing ethanol and, in a sense, agriculture out. That would make, of course, big oil very happy, particularly ARCO which is the largest manufacturer and importer of MTBE. I believe that we import about 70 percent of that MTBE, so it makes us further reliant on foreign sources of energy if MTBE replaces corn that is produced in the agricultural regions of the United States and then made into ethanol.

My colleagues may have also noted that there are recent articles detailing the sudden fondness and support ARCO has directed at President Clinton's energy tax proposals. This is some of this influence that I thought was in the last administration and I hoped was not in this administration. But, Madam President, the Btu tax on ethanol is just one of many devastating provisions included in this budget that hurts agriculture.

We have already evidently, because of Senator HARKIN's leadership, made a clear point that the increase in the barge diesel tax of \$1 a gallon should not go through. I hope that we follow through on that in the reconciliation bill. But this would cut down, depending on the size of the farming operation and the diversity of it, at least \$5,000 in a lot of farming operations.

The direct and indirect costs of the Btu tax will cut yet another \$1,600. I stated that in my debate last night.

The increased cost of meat inspection will be passed back to the farmer as well. So this ethanol issue is just one of many in this budget that is not very good for agriculture.

The Washington Post recently noted that agriculture is getting hit with 6.4 percent of the budget cuts while it comprises only 1.8 percent of the domestic spending.

Iowa's farm crisis hot line, which is a one-stop shopping place to get help, for emotional or financial stress if you are in agriculture, from people who have dealt with these crises in the past, is receiving the most calls it has seen any time since the height of the farm crisis in 1986.

This budget, I think, particularly if we do not get these ethanol issues taken care of, is going to put more of our farmers and rural Americans out of business. Is that part of the plan? Again, I would like to refer to the *Ag Commodities News and Views* to answer my question.

An EPA staff member was asked, what would be the benefits to U.S. agriculture by leaving Clinton's energy tax package as is?

The EPA staff member's response was, "There would be fewer farmers."

I only hope that President Clinton will start looking at this plan, the Btu tax and all the other things that impact on agriculture, including the ethanol issue that is in Senator WELLSTONE's amendment. I do not think President Clinton wants to hurt the farmers, and I hope that he will not. I hope he will look at it again and review it.

I would like to have one additional minute off the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, in conclusion, I simply hope we in agriculture, and I am in agriculture—my son operates our family farm—I hope, for the 2 percent of the people who provide the food for the other 98 percent of the people in this country, that this budget is reviewed from the point of view of the impact on agriculture and agriculture obviously will have to pay something toward getting the deficit down. Nobody in agriculture says otherwise. I suppose that can be some taxes as well as expenditures. But the point is it has to be more in proportion to the impact on the budget.

The President got a message from Ken Cook at the Center for Resource Economics. He warned President Clinton, and this was back in late November or early December, not to pursue "support from the farm community too aggressively" because Clinton drew "solid opposition in farm country" during the election.

There are a lot of people out there saying this President should not listen to agriculture because maybe not enough farmers voted for him. The bottom line is that I believe the President

understands a lot about agriculture, even though he comes from a State that is a little bit different farmingwise than Iowa is.

But the President should review this program, including what is in the Wellstone amendment, to make sure that he is giving agriculture the fair shot that he said during the campaign he was going to give it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask the manager of the bill to yield to me 10 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. On the amendment?

Mr. REID. Off the amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield the Senator 10 minutes off the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, on January 27 of this year, a new era began, the hydrogen era. That really is good news for this country. The bad news though, is that it did not begin in the United States. On January 27, a transit bus utilizing hydrogen in a fuel cell was demonstrated by a Canadian company, Ballard Power Systems. Ballard developed this fuel cell with strong support from the Canadian Government. Also, the Elenco bus in Belgium is scheduled to roll out later this year, again with reliance on a fuel cell provided by foreign technology.

It should be noted that last year the United States did complete the first phase of a passenger vehicle, a development program, by utilizing a Canadian fuel cell supplied by Ballard. Later this year, the U.S. Department of Energy, in conjunction with the Department of Transportation, will launch the first of three U.S. assembled fuel cell buses. The only problem, once again, is that this program will rely on a fuel cell developed and marketed by Fuji Electric of Japan, and it is ironic that this fuel-cell technology is based on Government patents obtained in the United States.

This is not the first time we have used our scientific genius to come up with new technology, only to have it developed in other countries. There are many examples. Magnetic levitation, Madam President, is the best as far as I am concerned. Two scientists, stuck in traffic in New York—these were scientists from MIT—said we should do something so that we do not have these problems, and they went back to their laboratories and discovered magnetic levitation, the ability to propel huge vehicles through the air, a fraction of an inch off the ground, at speeds of about 300 miles an hour. It is what we need to alleviate the problems we have on our highways and our airports.

This discovery was in the early part of the 1960's. The U.S. Federal Govern-

ment helped for a very short period of time. We stopped. The technology went to Japan and Germany, and it is now being developed there. They have prototypes, magnetic levitated vehicles that will be used in the United States. That is too bad because we, in effect, allowed tens of thousands of jobs to go across the oceans after making the inventions here in the United States.

I talk about hydrogen because it is another example of where we are not doing what needs to be done. It is often argued that the United States is the world leader in fuel cell technology, yet the stark reality is that we are lacking in our commitment to this area of technology.

I have often heard that there are huge technological barriers to bringing fuel-cell technology on line, but the barriers do not seem to be slowing down the Japanese, the Germans, or the Belgians.

The answer is U.S. companies, both large and small, are ready and willing to compete. We can perfect hydrogen technologies here at home. We have the ability and the knowledge. What is lacking is the commitment, the commitment of this Government to be involved in the development of technology.

This is not some socialistic view that was recently developed in the United States. We can go back to the early years of this country. Take, for example, Madam President, 1844. In that year, a man came to this Congress, to the Capitol of the United States and said I have a great idea. He was able to convince the Congress and the President to make an appropriation of \$40,000 to build a telegraph line between Baltimore, MD, and Washington, DC. The rest is history. The Federal Government appropriated \$40,000. After that, the telegraph lines swept not only the United States but the world and revolutionized communications.

The Federal Government must be involved in new, innovative technology, and we have not been. We do not have the commitment in this modern-day America, and that is too bad.

Monday morning my subcommittee of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is going to hold a hearing. This hearing will start next Monday at 9:30. We are going to have witnesses from a broad cross-section of the private sector and people from the Government to offer testimony in support of the conclusions I have just stated.

We need, I repeat, a commitment from our Government which, until now, has made hydrogen and transportation fuel cells a policy and budgetary afterthought. Let me give you an example of why I say that.

Last year we, as a Government, spent on this technology \$4 million; the grand sum of \$4 million for research and development of hydrogen. We spent \$12 million on fuel-cell development.

When you weigh what is going on in other countries with what we are doing in research and development for nuclear fission, \$700 million; \$500 million for fossil fuel, the amount we are spending for hydrogen and fuel cells seems hardly worth mentioning.

Yes, we also need a better commitment from Congress, a better commitment to invest in these high-payoff technologies, thereby sharing some of the risks with industry, which is standing at the doorstep waiting to perform.

Yes, we need a commitment from the motor vehicle industry—from the boardroom to the showroom—and the major oil companies across America which must eventually market and ship new sources of energy, to provide the engineering, design, manufacturing, and marketing skill that this technological revolution will require.

I have visited with leaders from the business and private sector. I visited numerous demonstration projects in the Western United States that are involved in various aspects of hydrogen technology. I know for a fact that there is great interest across the corporate and business community to develop hydrogen energy technologies and even convert some existing demonstration projects into commercial applications, as will be brought out in the testimony at the hearing next week.

Why is fuel cell transportation technology so important? Because it will serve as an important link in bridging the gap between our present reliance on fossil fuels to a cleaner and sustainable source of energy, hydrogen.

President Clinton and Vice President GORE in their recent release, "Technology for America's Economic Growth, a New Direction to Build Economic Strength," clearly outlined the need for a task force to link the research efforts of the major auto manufacturers and relevant agencies within Government to develop a clean car. The task force will investigate, among other things, fuel cells for hybrid vehicles and the production of methanol and hydrogen from natural gas, which is now plentiful, municipal waste and other waste products, energy crops, and the electrolysis of water.

Dr. John Gibbons, former head of technology assessment and now President Clinton's Director of Science and Technology Policy, will be testifying at the upcoming hearing on elements of this new technology plan relating to the areas I have just described. I believe the commitment from the administration in this area is abundantly clear, but we must transfer this good thought process to money so that we can put hydrogen to work.

I came to the floor several weeks ago and talked about the havoc that was being wreaked upon our global environment by oil spills. They continue to occur around the world, millions of gal-

lons of oil being spilled in our oceans; the continuing use of hydrocarbons for industrial purposes and vehicle fuels continue to drive the policymaking process in the direction of more and more regulation to deal with pollution and emissions. These new mandates as they occur, because of the demands on our present environment, end up costing the American consumer billions of dollars. If we had hydrogen fuel, and there was a wreck in the oceans with the hydrogen tanks, the emissions would be water vapor.

The question before us then is simply this: Are we interested in pursuing a policy that brings us to the point where environmental goals are accomplished through renewable energy technology? This point, when it is achieved, will mean saving billions of dollars.

And no one has to sacrifice along the way. As a matter of fact, quite the contrary will take place. Our national labs, many of which have contacted me about the upcoming hearing and have expressed their interest, can participate in developing these new environmental and energy technologies. Business need not suffer because they can participate and profit from this endeavor. Fuel cells, solar/hydrogen technologies, biomass conversion technologies, and a wide range of others mean new jobs, and future growth in our economy.

Hydrogen-fueled transportation will mean that future generations will retain their personal mobility without sacrificing our environment. Whether future generations of Americans will make these advanced systems or buy them from our neighbors is a question we as a society must answer.

The use of hydrogen energy in broader commercial applications will stabilize our environment, free billions of dollars to invest in our economy, and along the way offer thousands of people currently employed in our labs, the defense industry, and elsewhere the opportunity to continue to work in the field of emerging environmental and renewable energy technologies.

This, Madam President, must be the vision of the future, of our great country and, of course, thereafter the vision of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I wonder if I could have time yielded for a matter that is not current to the issue before us?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 10 minutes off the amendment if the Senator wants it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OREGON WAIVER

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the manager of the bill for yielding time.

Madam President, about a month ago I stood before the body and asked for cooperation to urge a decision on the Oregon Medicaid waiver.

At that time it was very important to have a prompt decision, based on my communication with Governor Roberts and the speaker of the house, Mr. Campbell, and the president of the senate, Senator Bradbury, due to the State's responsibility once the waiver is granted to come up with \$100 million of State contribution to implement the plan.

Secretary Shalala, who had the authority to grant the waiver, was asked to make this decision by the date March 19. I want to say that she has met her date. She has done so with the cooperation of many forces for which we are very grateful. Secretary Shalala has indicated today at noontime that she is going to approve if certain conditions are met at the State level, the Oregon waiver.

Let me just state very briefly what that means, because all, I think, agree that health care in America is in a critical condition. I believe that the Oregon plan can be the first step to recovery. For the simple proposition is this:

The Oregon Legislature, under the leadership of former Senator John Kitzhaber, a medical doctor, a Democrat, is leading us into the idea of bringing about universal coverage for the people of our State for basic health care.

Senator Kitzhaber, along with the Republican leadership on the house side, and working with the Governor, Gov. Barbara Roberts, proved that a bipartisan effort was possible to develop this kind of universal health care.

Madam President, there are 688 separate medical procedures that are ranked in the State of Oregon's plan. But the point is simply that we are going to take those 688 medical procedures, ranking them in how much longevity or extension of life can be achieved by certain procedures. Why should a person my age at public expense have a heart valve or a very expensive procedure if doing that would only extend my life by 3 to 4 years as against covering all women or a certain number of women with prenatal care with the potential of a life ahead? Those are tough decisions. People say, that is rationing medical care. Yes. But what is a cruel system? We ration medical care today on economics. Those who have resources have access. Those who have no resources have no access.

This waiver will mean that the Medicaid part of our contribution to Oregon will cover 120,000 Oregonians who are not now covered. It means the State must come up with approximately \$100 million of State aid to cover these Oregonians. Oregonians who today have no coverage. Indeed, a very innovative kind of proposal.

I stress the bipartisan support this proposal has. I especially want to commend the legislative delegation from Oregon, my colleague, Senator PACKWOOD, Congressman WYDEN on the House side, two very strong leaders on behalf of this Oregon waiver, along with all the other members of the delegation for their work on securing the waiver.

We attempted to get this waiver through Congress several years ago. There are two ways in which the waiver can be granted—through the legislative branch and/or the executive branch. With well-intentioned meaning it was set aside by Senator GORE. It was blocked on the House side by Congressman WAXMAN, two people who have great concerns about health care. I do not challenge their motivations.

Nevertheless, having failed in the legislative branch, we went to the executive branch to get the waiver. Again, there was bipartisan support from the State. Secretary Sullivan in effect signed off. We had OMB to sign off. The President, Mr. Bush, was very enthusiastic for it. But the Justice Department and the lawyers became involved.

There were legitimate questions raised about how this would impact on Americans With Disabilities Act. There were those who went to Oregon at the time representing the Justice Department trying to work out some semantics, and that proceeded but not sufficiently in time to get the waiver under the Bush administration.

Candidate Clinton in this last election stated his support for the Oregon waiver. Now as President of the United States and through the action of his Secretary of HHS, Ms. Shalala, they have fulfilled that campaign commitment, and they have sent us on our way to get this in operation.

Madam President, I cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that we today again are fashioning medical care on economics. The kind of prioritizing of medical procedures in Oregon will cover everybody with primary care. Sure, it is going to be tough for those who want some more expensive procedures. We all want them to save our lives at a time, or the lives of our family or our friends. But when you are looking at a constriction of capability of delivery being the restriction of economic dollars, we obviously have to set some kind of tough decisions and priority.

That has happened in Oregon. I understand the State of New York and the State of Vermont, and other States, want to follow in some form of an innovation at the State level. I think if we were really honest today, we would have to say before we consider an expansion of coverage at the national level, we need the experimentation, get the track record, the demonstration at the State level. What else is again a recommitment to the es-

sence of federalism, where so many progressive national laws have been based upon the experience of the States? This, in the field of health care gives Oregon, one of the great leaders of our country of innovative legislation, an opportunity to try coverage for all people at a basic level.

Madam President, I congratulate Secretary Shalala. She has expedited getting the administration on track, and with getting her house built. She probably put in a lot of hours to be able to achieve this deadline of today. She is to be commended for this hard work. We are all very grateful to Secretary Shalala.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I will speak on my time off the amendment that is pending. But before the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, leaves the floor, I just wanted to say that I really compliment the Senator on the statement this morning.

Just a few years ago, even that statement would have been something that no one would dare talk about, because the truth of the matter is that nobody wants to talk about the fact that we might not be able to take care of every single health delivery system activity in the United States in exactly the way we do right now. Some may be delayed a little longer than we have been used to delaying. Some that are not so critical to our well-being may indeed have to take their turn instead of getting taken care of tomorrow morning. Some expensive procedures may have to be evaluated with reference to their real effect.

Overall, sooner or later, the United States is going to have to find out what the real effects of health delivery to people are. It is not just going to be because we have been doing it and the doctor knows how to do it without risking your life in doing this; it does not mean we are going to keep doing those things. We are really going to find out what the outcomes are. The Senator from Oregon may be on the way to being the pioneer in America in trying to determine what the effect of the health delivery services and medical care really are in terms of outcomes. That has not been done in the United States.

Believe it or not, with all of our sophistication, we have not done very much outcomes evaluation, even with reference to some of our drugs. I see my friend, Senator PRYOR, here. I mean, they do not hurt, and they make you feel better. Real outcomes, though, as compared with whether we know how to do this, and it will not hurt you, and in the process we take care of something. What does it mean once you put it out on the street and everybody starts doing it in their medical offices and hospitals? I compliment the State of Oregon; I think he put it right on the mark.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am trying to make sure that I understand the parliamentary situation for a moment. There is a pending Wellstone amendment, and there is some time left on it on our side, if we assume that we are going to use the full hour. How much is that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 53 minutes in opposition on the amendment.

I see my friend, Senator DURENBERGER, here. I assume he wants to talk to the Senate today about either the Wellstone amendment and/or an amendment he might have in the future with reference to a similar subject.

I yield 10 minutes to Senator DURENBERGER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] is recognized.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak both relative to the sense-of-the-Senate resolution offered by my colleague from Minnesota and also to an amendment which I intend to file later and have acted upon later that addresses this same issue in a slightly different way.

Madam President, I came to the Senate from Minnesota back in 1978, and I was not here more than a couple of months, and we saw the crisis develop in Iran, and we saw an energy crisis develop all over this country. I was plunged almost immediately into the debate over energy policy in this country.

The Senate Finance Committee was deeply involved in it. We did the windfall profits tax. We did a whole variety of energy, policy-inducing, conservation-inducing, tax-related policies, which at that time were intended to make America, in the eyes of some, energy independent and, in the eyes of others, to give us some sense of energy direction.

In that period of time, the end of the 1970's and 1980's, my State of Minnesota sort of stuck out at the end of the pipes. We do not make any fuel sources there. We import them. Most of the things that we grow or make in Minnesota, we have to export to distant markets. Our pipelines from Canada were sort of shutdown when prices for natural gas went up. So our prices went up all over the place, and we were being strangled. So we had a lot of first hand experience in wind-operated wind mills, which sprung up on our farms, and that could then be cogenerated into farm housing.

In the backyard was the old still. I come from the part of Minnesota which, in current times, is famous for

Lake Wobegon and the Keillor Prairie Home Companion. In the old basement was Minnesota 13, which was the best moonshine in America. My father actually worked his way through college by playing basketball on the weekends and carrying a little moon in the rumble seat of his automobile down to the Twin Cities, which was 80 miles away and dispensing it.

Well, in the late 1970's and early 1980's, those stills became alternative fuel sources on farms, because alcohol was being generated back there not to peddle to the basketball audiences or the bars in Minneapolis or St. Paul, but it was being peddled to be blended with gasoline into this new thing called gasohol. Today, we call it ethanol, and we have a natural gas derivative, which is somewhat comparable to it, other than in its environmental impacts, that comes from natural gas called methanol.

So there is much to say about the amendment before us. I have drawn a rich history of experience in the Senate, the last being in the debate on the clean air act. In that debate, we did a lot on reformulated gasolines; we did a lot on reformulated fuels and a lot of things to clean up the air, and made a lot of decisions which people have been trying to undo since then, many of which dealt with cleaner burning oxygenated fuels like ethanol. So I do not come here from just a parochial interest. I come here from a fair amount of experience trying to find an energy policy for America, and also trying to find in renewal fuels an opportunity for my constituents.

So at the appropriate time in the course of this debate, I will offer an amendment which will be a lot more than a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. It will actually reduce revenue, and it will contain offsetting spending cuts. In other words, it is going to give us a real road map, and it will give some breathing room to the Finance Committee. I say to my colleague from Arkansas on the floor right now, to use up when we take up reconciliation.

If we do not cut the revenue requirements levied on the Finance Committee, it will be difficult to argue that we are really serious.

I ask my colleagues to consider whether, with all the pressures on the Finance Committee, we can be sure we will accomplish our goals without shutting down the other interests which will be competing with ethanol for advantage.

My amendment will state the Senate's intention. We do not raise taxes elsewhere to take care of ethanol in terms of the Btu tax. We actually cut taxes on spending a little bit.

If you want to send a signal to the Finance Committee, I say to my friends, let us show them we mean business. The people interested in helping ethanol want us to really accept it,

not to make promises that are going to turn out to be just empty promises.

My amendment will cut spending in function 920 by the revenues foregone by not taxing ethanol. Why should ethanol be exempt from the Btu tax? Currently, the U.S. Government has invested in ethanol. It has an advantage of 7 cents a gallon over regular gasoline, and the reason for that Congress agreed. Ethanol was better for the environment. It is better because it reduces smog and gives cleaner air to breathe. It is that simple.

When I came to the Senate, as I said, in the seventies, there was a great deal of interest in a mixture that was 10 percent ethanol and 10 percent gasoline because of the energy problems facing the Nation. As consciousness of environmental degradation increased during the eighties, we recognized the health and environmental benefits as well.

Beside cutting down on smog, ethanol has another environmental advantage. One of the most serious pollution problems that our northern cities face in the winter time is carbon monoxide. Look at the signs in Denver and Minneapolis at the airport: Do not let your car idle at this particular point.

When you start a car on a cold winter morning, the fuel does not burn well, and carbon monoxide is produced in quantities enough to be detrimental to breathe to those with heart problems and pregnant women. It reduces carbon pollution because it contains more oxygen molecules and other components of gasoline and improve the combustion process in cold engines.

Many of the 40 cities of America that do not meet Federal carbon pollution standards are looking for ethanol as a partial solution to the problem.

In 1990 it was my amendment to the Clean Air Act that required the EPA issue regulations for gasoline that will reduce smoking emission by 15 percent by 1995. The Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President agreed with me that ethanol will help us make our air cleaner. Ethanol production is still getting off the ground and without the investment, if I may use President Clinton's words, that the Government currently makes in ethanol we could ruin this industry. That would be bad for the environment, but it would also be very bad for Minnesota and America's farmers.

Not only do the farmers grow the corn that makes the Nation's ethanol, but they have invested in the ethanol facilities themselves. Without the American farmer community, the reformulated gasoline amendment to the Clean Air Act would never have been approved.

So, Madam President, with corn prices below \$2 a bushel, the corn farmers of Minnesota, Iowa, and the rest of that part of the country are not only hurting, as you heard on the floor here

in the last 24 hours, many are on the brink of disaster.

Industrial use of corn is good for the farmer and rural communities that rely on them. So far, Minnesota farmers and farm cooperatives have invested \$109 million in 4 ethanol plants that produce 40 million gallons of ethanol annually. Plans are to build another in rural Minnesota to produce 126 million gallons of ethanol yearly.

Just the construction of these new plants will add an additional \$8.6 million to rural Minnesota communities.

Last night, Madam President, we were unable to roll back the entire energy tax, but we will have the opportunity to provide a real incentive for a renewal, environmentally sound energy source or, to put it differently, today we have the opportunity to prevent additional tax being levied on the back of the American farmer.

We can do it in a way that is as binding a way as we possibly can in a budget resolution that will make sure that our intentions are honored all the way through the process.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I will offer at an appropriate time later in the debate on this resolution.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I ask my colleague from New Mexico if he would have any objection to my taking 2 minutes as though in morning business for some matters that I need to discharge.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection. We are still going to use our hour. We are going to take 2 extra minutes. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARTHA FINCH

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, in the midst of all the difficulties and problems and darkness of the world we live in, every now and then a clear beacon of hope and courage shines out. One such beacon was Martha Finch, whose incredible, inspiring life ended yesterday after 31 remarkable years.

Martha grew up in the western suburbs of the Twin Cities. After a distinguished high school career, which was recognized by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce when they named her Outstanding All Around Woman of her school, she went on to the St. Lawrence University in New York. There she received all-American honors in both track and swimming. She set a record for the 200 yard butterfly that still stands today. She had qualified to run in the Boston Marathon.

Then her life changed. Struck by a motorcycle during a training run in Colorado, she suffered a severe brain damage in 1983. After a year in the hospital and numerous operations, she brought the same determination to her

recovery that she did to her athletic endeavors.

She became involved in the Minnesota Head Injury Association, and helped advance understanding among Minnesotans for the need for awareness and treatment of individuals with traumatic brain injuries.

She became involved in the disability rights issues, and was a part of the Minnesota groups that help us pass the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990.

She helped me develop a major piece of legislation entitled the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Quality Act, S. 3002, which I will continue to work to pass.

She also became a regular volunteer in my office, helping us with the computer work in my Minneapolis office.

Our sense of sadness at her passing, which is very deep, is overwhelmed by our sense of gratitude for having known such a person as Martha. If ever a thought of complacency or self-pity or slackness entered our mind, one glimpse of Martha, or one of her priceless notes, straightened us up and pushed us forward.

William Faulkner wrote, "I decline to accept the end of man * * *. I believe mankind will not only endure, it will prevail." Martha Finch, did not just endure. From the beginning of her life to the end, she prevailed.

LEARNING FROM THE ASPIN EXPERIENCE

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, the illness of a major public figure usually piques our national interest in the specifics of the disease, and in the possible treatments. We all remember President Bush's heart rhythms, President Clinton's asthma, and President Reagan's skin cancer and hearing aid. Aside from illnesses in our own families, this is how most Americans learn about advancements in medical science.

Les Aspin, my former Hill colleague who is now Secretary of Defense, is the latest to become the object of America's medical attention. Fortunately for Les, he is poised to receive a medical technology that may save and extend his life—and all Americans are praying for his recovery.

In today's Washington Post, we all learned something about his disease—obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, which amounts to a thickening of the heart muscle. The implantation of a pacemaker may change the physiology of his heart by improving its pumping capacity.

As a Minnesotan—and as a Senator committed to health reform—I think we can learn a valuable lesson from Secretary Aspin's unfortunate condition.

Minnesota is the birthplace of cardiac pacing technology. Working out of his garage in Minnesota back in 1958,

Earl Baaken teamed up with C. Walton Lillehie at the University of Minnesota to build the first battery-operated pacemaker.

Through the years, the technology has advanced from cumbersome external devices, to implants the size of hockey pucks, to the tiny, highly complex, multifaceted devices available today.

Les Aspin is receiving a dual-chambered device, first made available in the 1980's. The safety of this device is well established. However, in his case, it is being used for a new purpose. The New York Times referred to it as "an ingenious use of an older medical technology."

It is worth noting that doctors are generally not free to pursue these ingenious uses. Every new application of an already approved device must be reviewed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Madam President, it is absolutely essential that we have timely review of new applications of existing technology to treat new states to disease. We need an agency that moves quickly—so that all patients, not just those in the public eye, have access to them.

I hope, based on this experience with Les Aspin, that FDA will be encouraged to move quickly to approve dual chamber pacemakers for this kind of condition.

Fortunately for Mr. Aspin, he does not have another type of heart condition characterized by a rapid heartbeat. Over 150,000 Americans do. If he needed a defibrillator to correct accelerated heartbeats, he would not be able to get the state-of-the-art technology in America. He could get the pacemaker implanted, but doctors would have to crack open his chest surgically to do so.

A more advanced product—made in Minnesota—that allows doctors to implant the device without major surgery subjected to several years of delay. The result: Patients in Europe and other parts of the world received this new product long before it was available to Americans. Fortunately, this device was finally approved late last fall.

There is a remarkable irony here. The very best technology is invented in America—but too often Americans themselves are deprived of it.

Conclusion: We have to encourage our Government regulators to move with all deliberate speed.

And Les Aspin is fortunate that he will receive his pacemaker now. Another problem looming on the horizon may threaten the availability of pacemakers and other implantable products in the future. Many implantables include small amounts of dacron, teflon, and other materials necessary for their fabrication.

Because of their fear of product liability lawsuits, suppliers of small amounts of these critical components

are considering restricting their supplies. Unless we can figure out how to limit the liability of remote suppliers, the availability of many lifesaving products may be compromised.

One aspect of Secretary Aspin's condition that has been very little discussed is the cost of his care. As we grapple with cost issues more generally in the consideration of health reform, Secretary Aspin's pacemaker ought to be a useful reminder of the benefits of technology and its contribution to quality, state-of-the-art care.

What happens to these technologies if the Government arbitrarily imposes cost controls? Will inventors stop investing in a market hostile to technology?

Innovation is an ongoing process—the evolution of the pacemaker illustrates this. Just as pacemaker technology has changed from the 1950's to the 1990's, so will it continue to improve into the 21st century.

Our concern with cost control should not blind us to the incredible advances that may be coming in our future. It is far better to eliminate unnecessary services than to block the invention that will make our medicine better—and more cost effective—in the 21st century.

Madam President, let me conclude by asking my colleagues to say a prayer for Les Aspin's speedy recovery—and to learn from his misfortune.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I would like to take just a few minutes at the outset of this debate to outline my views on the budget resolution that has now come before us.

I think it would be fair to say that few Members on my side of the aisle have been as willing to give credit to the efforts President Clinton has made in a wide variety of areas, including his framing of a budget proposal, to address this Nation's vital needs. The President's work on health care reform, in which he has been ably assisted by the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, is another example of the leadership he has been able to offer us.

THE ECONOMY

The President inherited an economic situation that is, far from being a disaster, not at all that bad.

Under President Bush, growth was up sharply. Inflation was down, as it had been for years. Unemployment declined, under President Bush, nearly to the level it was at before the recession

began, and it has now reached that level again.

Productivity is up, sharply—and is probably largely responsible for the fact that unemployment has not yet declined further. And productivity is the key to economic progress.

Interest rates were down under President Bush, and long-term rates have come down even further.

We are, however, still faced with an unacceptable budget deficit, a staggering national debt, rising health care costs, and entitlement costs that are out of control.

WHAT WILL THIS BUDGET PRODUCE?

I regret to say that this budget is simply the wrong budget for a recovering economy and the wrong budget for a country dealing with a large deficit. I hope it can be improved in the amendment process, but if it is not improved, I doubt that I can support it.

It does not address the budget deficit effectively or appropriately. Now it is being rushed through the Congress by party line votes, before we even have seen the details.

THE STIMULUS PROGRAM

The President's proposal starts by spending a great deal of money on an unneeded stimulus program. That program runs up the deficit while spending money on a lot of programs that, with few exceptions, either don't fund jobs or are likely, at best, to fund only a few jobs—and then only several months or even years down the road. For every new dollar spent on these few and distant jobs, a dollar will be squeezed out of the economy in the form of taxes and borrowing, and will serve only to dampen the recovery.

Even after the modifications made by the Budget Committee Democrats, the deficit in 1993 actually goes up by \$6 billion from what it would have been absent this program—this at a time when the American people are demanding deficit reduction.

THE 1994 BUDGET

What about the budget plan for fiscal 1994?

Spending on the discretionary part of the budget goes up by \$6 billion over the baseline.

Spending on mandatory programs is cut not one penny, compared to the CBO baseline. And the baseline is a sort of artificial concept—in fact, spending is going to go up by \$45 billion between 1993 and 1994 under current policy. We're not even addressing that problems in this budget package.

I would point out that these baseline increases—over the next 6 years—eat up many times the amount of the proposed spending cuts, and that's before all the program spending increases are factored in.

How about taxes? Well, they do up by \$36 billion over the baseline in that 1 year. That's \$8 billion more in taxes than even the President proposed.

THE OUT-YEARS

The first law of budgeting ought to be: get the spending cuts first. And that law is not lost on the voters. In my State, even those who support the President's plan think we ought to get the cuts first.

This budget turns that law on its head. Nearly all the spending cuts, such as they are, come at the end of the process—when they are subject to renewed political pressure to postpone or strike them.

And even assuming that the spending cuts come—and I doubt that they will—the balance is all out of whack.

We are raising taxes about \$3 for every \$1 of spending cut, over the 6 years of this program.

DO WE NEED TO RAISE TAXES?

We should only raise taxes as part of a truly balanced deficit reduction program, only when they are truly needed, and only if the taxes are effective, fair, and not harmful to the economy.

But those arguing for tax increases have not yet carried the burden of persuasion. They haven't come close. If we bind ourselves to raise \$295 billion during the next 6 years, we are talking about the biggest tax increase ever to pass the Congress.

Mr. President, during the 6 years between 1993 and 1998, the Federal Government will spend roughly \$3,336 billion on discretionary programs, if we do nothing. If we adopt all these tax increases, and the rest of the so-called cuts in this package, we will cut about \$49 billion—that is, instead of spending \$3,336 billion, we will spend \$3,287 billion. That is a decrease of less than 2 percent.

When it comes to mandatory and entitlement spending, the Federal Government will spend roughly \$5,418 billion, if we do nothing. If we adopt all the changes in this package, we will cut about \$38 billion—almost all in the last 2 years of the package.

We have to be able to cut discretionary and mandatory spending by more than about 1 percent over the course of a 6-year program. And yet that is all the cutting that occurs in this package.

In 1985, and at other times, I and other Republican Senators were willing to make tough decisions to cut back on entitlement programs. We passed those cuts—and they were real cuts—by the narrowest of margins here, but were unable to get them enacted into law.

In that key 1985 vote, we wheeled our former colleague from California, Pete Wilson, in here on a gurney to vote for serious cuts in entitlements. His deciding vote gave the Senate a brief, shining moment of victory in the battle against the deficit. On that vote, we stepped up to the plate—and brought America as close to fiscal sanity as it has been in the last decade.

The results of that 1 day of achievement were subsequently undone. And the deficit kept on mounting.

Madam President, we cannot let the people down again.

During the next few days, we will have the opportunity to take up a series of amendments to this budget. I hope that they will be reviewed carefully, on the merits, by all my colleagues. All of us want an effective budget proposal. It is time to put politics aside and vote for the amendments that will give our constituents the real reforms they seek.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I yield myself as much time as needed. I am waiting for some Senators on our side. But I do not want to delay matters.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, if Senators CONRAD BURNS or SLADE GORTON are here, we would like very much for them to talk about amendments they are going to offer next week as soon as they can.

Madam President, I want to take a little time to talk about the energy tax which is being requested by the President of the United States, commonly known as the Btu tax, which means that we are going to make an effort to tax certain of our energy sources in the United States from natural gas to hydropower to everything that comes from crude oil, coal and nuclear. We are going to attempt to tax them on the basis of the British thermal unit measurement, but we are going to have varying rates that we are going to apply to these.

One of the things that really struck me is that for a while it was being said that this was an environmentally sound approach. I have done my very best to see how it is environmentally sound to tax in the manner that is being recommended.

First, the highest taxes of all are the British thermal units that come from crude oil, from oil, and the way it is being proposed, Madam President, is that you are going to tax those Btu's coming from crude oil in such a way that and at a collection point in the stream of its development in such a way that you are going to build a big incentive in favor of foreign products that are made from crude oil, the things that refineries make, the things that are distilled from it, gasoline, diesel fuel, and many others. You are going to give foreign production of those an advantage over our own which seems to me to mean that you put an import fee on our own crude oil. We need that about like we need a hole in the head.

Our domestic production is already so expensive compared to others that we are not producing as much crude oil as we should.

But what is happening with this tax is that you are going to cause America to produce less crude oil. Its independent producers and its majors are going to produce less, and that has now been steady. So we diminish our production. Lo and behold, we thought this was going to dramatically cause us to import less. It turns out, we are not going to import less. Over time, we are going to import more.

So I think it is a pure dud when it comes to its efficacy on changing anything on the crude oil side, excepting more dependence and less American production.

Now that comes about in a strange way, because we tax it higher than others. It is very interesting. We tax it very, very much higher than we tax coal. So you can burn coal and produce these British thermal units per certain quantity of coal, and that is taxed far less than crude oil.

Frankly, we cannot understand how that makes environmental sense. We really do not believe that the products of burning coal are going to less pollute the environment than the products that comes from crude oil that are used in a variety of ways, especially since you are not going to use any less crude oil products with the tax because you are going to use more imports.

In addition, the cleanest two fuels, maybe the cleanest three—natural gas, hydropower, and nuclear power—are taxed higher than coal. We do not think that makes sense. But they are the cleanest and they are taxed higher than coal.

Now, I do not know why this happened. It sounds like some kind of regionalism, at best. And maybe it is more than that. Maybe it is just a reference toward coal. I see no reason why we ought to do that as a nation.

We have natural gas in abundance. It is very clear we were moving in the direction of using it. Now we are going to penalize it.

So I am going to offer an amendment next week on this subject which will let the Senate vote on whether they want this kind of discrimination among our fuels, with no rational or commonsense reason for it.

Frankly, I think we ought to encourage the production of American crude oil and we ought not penalize it. We ought to encourage the use of natural gas, the cleanest of the fuels, not penalize it. If we are going to penalize, we ought to penalize in the reverse order of this proposal. So that will be one amendment.

The second amendment I will have, it seems to me that the Department of Defense, which is already getting ratcheted down by \$112 billion new set of cuts on top of the \$73 billion that President Bush had, that we are going to ask the Defense Department to pay this new Btu tax.

We think it is going to cost \$800 million a year. We think it is about close to \$4 billion over this 5-year budget.

My amendment is going to be very simple. It is going to say: Why not exempt from the tax the fuel the Government uses for its defense? Do we want to take it out of one pocket and put in the other tax pocket. To take it out of Defense that way seems to me to be rather irrational.

On the other hand, the way this tax is collected in the proposal by our President makes it so difficult that maybe you cannot even exempt Defense. Because, you see, if you go by gasoline, it has not been added to the price of gasoline as a tax. So that you say, "Oh, on this one, do not collect 8 cents, because it is taxed way beyond that at the wellhead." So that nobody ever knows that there is a tax, you see. That is part of this Btu. Nobody knows on their electric bill, their heating fuel bill, their bill to the Defense Department for all these various things, the bill the farmer pays for all those fuels on the farm, nobody says there is a tax added to it. They are just going to pay 7 cents more, 8 cents more, 10 cents more, and the tax will be hidden.

Nevertheless, I am going to ask the Senate to make a little bit of sense out of why should we make the Defense Department pay, when it is just our own money, our own dollars being put back in the tax coffers. It seems to me to be kind of absurd.

So those are two amendments that I will be offering next week.

I will be talking now about a third amendment that I will offer next week.

For those who are wondering why I am doing this this way, let me just suggest that when we get back on the bill, we may not have time on these amendments. We may have 2 minutes; we may not have any time.

On every amendment that is going to be called up, each side could talk an hour on the amendment itself, and there may be no time to even discuss what you have in mind at the end. There may only be an hour on 20 amendments.

So I think I will use part of my time on the Wellstone amendment to talk about the third amendment. I call it a delayed enrollment of the stimulus package.

There is a growing bipartisan concern about this so-called stimulus package. Hopefully, we will discuss it in depth on the floor, because it will be an appropriation bill.

Suffice it to say, I do not think the American people would be as excited about it if they understood that there are a lot of things in it that nobody would consider a stimulus.

There is \$23 million in this proposal to help the 500 biggest American corporations conserve energy. I do not know how that is a stimulus. Frankly, it is kind of absurd. We are going to give them \$23 million in grants and then we are going to have a Btu tax coming right behind it, going to charge

them far more than we ever granted to them to conserve.

I would think you should not have both. If you are going to raise their tax, perhaps on the Btu's and energy, that will probably stop consumption, if it is wasteful. But why, then, give the tax dollars away in the name of a stimulus?

Also, there is \$28 million in that package, it is my recollection, to help the District of Columbia to restructure its debt, or pay its debt. I really do not think the American people believe that our President had in mind a \$16 billion stimulus package that had things like that in it.

But the overriding issue is, why should we increase the deficit by that amount of money, \$16 billion, why should we do that if we are not even sure we are going to get the savings that the President claims in his budget proposal?

So all I am going to do with that amendment is, I am going to say that we ought to delay the stimulus package until Congress has finished its work on the legislation, which will pay for it and which will supposedly cut the deficit.

Now I think that is kind of fair. That is saying to our taxpayers, at least to those who want to spend this money—I do not want to spend this money. I think the economy is recovering fine. I do not want to pay \$50,000 a job, which is the average cost of a new job under the stimulus package. I do not think our taxpayers ought to pay that.

There has been 600,000 new jobs proposed without us spending this money, and we are not going to do any better trying to target it around with Federal money at \$50,000 to \$55,000 a job. So I do not want it at all.

But I am afraid the Senator from New Mexico is going to lose. So I would like them to delay putting it into effect until we pass the language in the legislation that says, here is how we are going to take care of the deficit, even the deficit reduction the President speaks of.

So, that is a third one.

Then I am not at all sure I am going to have very much time on a fourth one next week so I am going to talk about it for a moment. Sooner or later, before we finish, the Senate will have to vote on this one.

This reconciliation instruction in this package says that we are to reconcile and create a new law that will say "no debt limit will be considered outside of reconciliation." That means if there is a year that we do not have a budget resolution that mandates new taxes or new spending cuts, we would not have any way to pass a debt limit extension.

I think the theory was good. I think the Senator who wanted this, who has been working on this, had a real good idea in mind.

But we could have to raise the deficit because we were off on our estimates, and we may not at all be trying to reduce them back to that level because we made estimating errors. But the debt may run out. What are we going to do? We are going to have to pass a budget resolution that includes reconciliation so we can put a debt limit extension bill in.

I really think the way we are doing it now, be it cumbersome, difficult—vehicles used by Members to offer all kinds of amendments—I really think the U.S. Senate probably does not want to risk the validity of our national debt and our ability to continue to pay checks to Social Security and other things, which is what happens when you cannot extend the debt. I do not think we would want to limit that in a way we cannot quite fathom from the standpoint of economics and the like, that we are really going to guess that maybe we will be able to extend it in reconciliation only.

That is a fourth one.

At this point I inquire how much time does the Senator from New Mexico have in opposition to the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 29 minutes and 20 seconds remaining on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will use the 20 seconds right now. How much time is there on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 12 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if I might make a proposal that we both yield back our time and that we, nonetheless, count the time yielded back against the resolution in the manner that it would have evolved had we used our time?

Mr. PRYOR. I would respond by saying that as long as the time yielded back is charged against the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Right.

Mr. PRYOR. That is satisfactory to us.

Mr. DOMENICI. I add that to my request. In other words, we yield back our time and it will be just as if we each used our hour against the resolution in the manner described.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. From our side, I assume we are ready to move off the resolution. I understood perhaps the majority side was, so long as we used that amount of time.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I think it would be appropriate at this time to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time being charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, and I must, just because I need to understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I understand the majority has a Senator who wants to speak for 10 minutes on the amendment. I would like to propound a unanimous-consent request to my friend from Arkansas that says when that Senator arrives he can speak for 10 minutes, and that we will charge each side the full hour on the amendment as if we used it, and then we will go and we will get off the resolution. Is that fair enough?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, the Senator from Arkansas has just been advised there is one additional Senator, I believe on this side of the aisle, who is desirous of speaking on the amendment—I assume on the Wellstone amendment.

Madam President, I still think it might be in the best interests of the Senate for the moment to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time being charged to each side equally.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is my understanding that the proponents' side for the Wellstone amendment has 12 minutes remaining on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, given that information I therefore yield those 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding the time.

I have been listening with great interest to the discussion about the budget, which has wandered to and fro for a couple of days now in this Chamber. Some of the discussion suggests to me that one could have been in a coma, and upon awakening, asked essentially the same questions that were asked before they went into the coma a year or two earlier. It is as if some people here have missed both time and events.

Let me describe what I mean. Some stand up in this Chamber and say: The President has proposed tax increases. Tax increases? We do not want tax increases. We do not need tax increases. That is not a solution that is good for this country.

We have heard that before. I have heard that for a number of years on the

floor of the U.S. House where I served. It was always, no, no tax increases. I joined those who said we do not like taxes. I personally do not like taxes, I would prefer not to pay taxes. It would be nice if the tax rate in America were zero. Of course, that is not possible. We do some important things together in something called government. We do them together for a lot of good reasons.

We need to educate our children, so we have a school, and we pay for it. It is called government. We are concerned about safety, having our neighborhoods and communities safe, so we hire police. It is called government.

Frankly, not too long ago a young 2-year-old named Mike ate a cheeseburger at a fast food hamburger restaurant and died because bad meat got through the inspection system in this country. Everyone expects that meat will be safe to eat, but it was not. Right this minute, somewhere a meat inspector is protecting the safety of the American people. It is called government. Government is not evil; government is not bad. There are a lot of government functions that are necessary and good and part of our daily living.

I would like it if we did not have to pay for that, but we do. I understand that and we all understand that. However, in recent years we have gotten a lot of government. We have had more government than we can pay for. We are charging \$1 billion a day to the children because, we are spending \$1 billion more than we are raising in revenue. This country is heading in the wrong direction and this country is in trouble.

In November 1992, the American people said we want to change the direction of this country. We wanted fundamental economic change and we elected Bill Clinton as President of the United States.

Bill Clinton has sent to this Chamber a plan. This plan is for fundamental economic change. It is a new direction, a new opportunity for this country, and I agree with him. Oh, I have seen all the charts, and I have heard all the eloquent speeches in this Chamber. You can see the slices of a million lances on where and why it is wrong.

The fact is it represents economic change, and a new direction. Those who say "no" are those who want to guard the gridlock: "Gee, let us just keep doing what we have been doing." It is the old Beatles song, "Let It Be; Just Let It Be." If we let it be, this country is not going to survive. We must have economic change.

Madam President, in recent days, we have seen our friends on the other side of the aisle stand up and they say, "You know, in the last quarter of the year, we had 4.8-percent economic growth, we don't need this plan, and we don't need economic stimulus. This country is just charging toward economic growth."

The Wall Street Journal says, "we have this tremendous economic growth," but it admits we do not have many jobs with it. Tell me, what is economic growth without jobs? A meal without food? What is economic growth if you do not have jobs?

We are in a situation where we need economic growth with real jobs and real opportunity. So we are told because of these economic indicators, this regurgitation of economic information from economists, that the country is now all right and we do not have to do anything. That is what we are told.

I would like to just spend a couple of minutes talking about what the economic indicators indicate in this country. For all those folks who find that the economic indicators give them comfort for the weekend, I would like to say what the economic indicators really indicate.

Did you know that of the 4.8 percent in economic growth, one-half percent was Hurricane Andrew? The interesting thing is, these economists—who could do this blindfolded in a bunker, never having seen humanity or reality—simply measure a quantification of effort. A giant hurricane comes through and knocks down buildings, and creates rampant destruction. This measures the economic startup to repair and rebuild, and do all the things you have to do to respond to a natural disaster.

But the interesting sidelight is, it does not measure the destruction. So you have an economic indicator that says, hey, this is a pretty good deal; we had a big hurricane and the country is growing again. The indicator does not happen to measure the fact that we lost a tremendous number of lives and value because of the hurricane.

Economic indicators might show a growth rate which is entirely false in terms of how the country is progressing.

Let me talk just a bit more about what economic indicators really indicate. The economists would have us believe that if the economic indicators are simply up, the country is actually moving ahead. But if there is a car accident this afternoon outside this building, and the activities from it are measured as economic growth. A car accident is translated into economic growth, just as the hurricane is, because somebody goes to the hospital, health care workers have to work on them, somebody has to fix a dented fender, and lawyers will do very well because there will probably be a lawsuit.

The question is: Is that growth? Does that move the country ahead? The answer is, of course not.

What is growing in America? We are growing litigation. Everybody knows that. We are growing more and more lawsuits. Does that mean we are moving the country ahead? No but it means more GNP.

We are growing gambling. A third of a trillion dollars is gambled in this country. Does that move the country ahead? No. It sparks the GNP, but is that a sign of economic health? It is not a sign of economic health to me.

We are growing disease and cancer. We have an enormous problem with cancer in this country, which also shows up in GNP in increased health care costs. We are growing bankruptcies. We are growing plastic surgery, cosmetic surgery.

If you just take a look at what economic indicators indicate, it is not altogether clear, if you show a quarter of an economic growth—if a fair share of that growth comes from a hurricane—that this country is doing well. No, I do not think anybody can conclude that there is any information on the horizon that does not suggest the need for fundamental economic change. Change from what we have been doing for a decade.

We have had people on both sides of the aisle speak as to what went wrong, and who caused it. I have a lot of notions about that. There is a lot of trouble in Government. The public sector has been off track something fierce with enormous debts and deficits. And yet, some of those who have been the fiercest critics of government are up in corporate suites and have outdone us with debt. Debt to them was no deterrent. They were not trying to figure out how to build a better product and how to sell it for a better price, they were trying to figure out how to buy another company and take it apart.

Debt works in both the public and private sectors. We have had an orgy of greed, it seems to me, in both areas. You cannot take a look at the eighties with its hostile takeovers, junk bonds, and excesses of greed, and not understand this country's trouble. The 1980's are going to go down in the history books like the gay nineties and the roaring twenties. The eighties will be registered in the history books with respect to its excesses.

We have a lot of work to do to put this country back on track.

What we ought to be saying, "President Clinton, your plan is a change in direction; it moves us in a different direction; we are going to move forward; we are going to push for it; we are going to put this country back on track."

Is the President's plan perfect? Of course not. Can I make improvements? I expect so. I suspect everybody here has some ideas, and we will make adjustments here and there. But is it change? You bet it is change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I request an additional 10 minutes out of the time on the resolution.

Mrs. MURRAY. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. If the economic indicators are not truly indicators to a robust growth in the right direction, then what do they indicate and where do we want to go?

Well, it seems to me, we want to move toward the goals President Clinton has established for this country. A family cannot spend more than it has and a business cannot spend more than it has. They must balance their checkbooks. So let us look at this budget through the eye of a family, the American family.

We are sitting down some night looking at the problem. Our problem is we are spending too much. We are spending more money than we are bringing in. What as a family will we do? Will we cut our spending? Sure; we should. Will we try to find ways to secure more income for our family? We should. But would we not also figure out if there were some ways for us to invest in our family? We would support finding a way to get more income and then we would invest in our family as well. And believe me, there is a difference in investment and spending.

If our family, husband and wife, smoke two packs of cigarettes a day, they are spending about \$3,500 a year on cigarettes. Is that an investment? No; I do not think so. Is it spending? Of course, it is spending.

But if you took that same \$3,500 and they did not smoke it up, but instead invested it in a kid's education, is that different? Of course it is. One is spending to smoke and one is investing in the family's future. That is all Bill Clinton is saying.

President Clinton is asking us let us look at three approaches. Let us increase some taxes because we must. Let us ask the wealthier in this country to pay more because they should. Let us cut some spending because it is appropriate. But let us also invest, so that when we get this country jump started and start moving, we will have opportunity in the future due to the investments we are making today. When we invest in American children, in education and opportunity, that is an investment that will yield enormous rewards for us for years to come.

If we do not deal with this appropriately, if we do not enact fundamental economic change in this budget plan, then this country is not going to move ahead with the kind of growth and opportunity that we deserve. He is also offering us a different trade policy, and we must have that as well as economic change; a different education policy, and we must have that as well as economic change; a different health care policy, and we must have that as well as economic change.

Let me just spend a moment on each of them.

Health care. Put an American car next to a Japanese car and ask a person to come up and shop for those two

cars. It is the same car, same reliability, same quality, same everything, except one is going to cost you \$700 more. Do you know why? Because that company had to spend \$700 more on its health care costs. That is the American car. It makes us uncompetitive aside from all the other problems of health care; it means we are losing in the international market place, aside from the fact that some young kid is not getting health care and some old woman who desperately needs it, is not getting the health care they need. It also is making this country loose ground in the international market-place.

So we must fix our health care system. We will not control our Federal deficit unless we deal with our health care system and control skyrocketing costs. President Clinton is offering a change in direction in health care. Jimmy Carter threatened all in the health care industry with cost containment. He said, "You all control your own costs or we are going to slap cost containment on." Ronald Reagan came to town and do you know what he said? "My friends from the health care industry, let me send a word to all of you: I don't believe in cost containment; I don't believe in cost controls; you do whatever you want."

And they sure did. The price of drugs, the price of hospitals, and the price of doctor care has skyrocketed right through the roof. President Clinton is going to propose significant health care reform.

Education reform. We cannot continue down the road we have been on with our schools in this country. We have to change. We are not going to compete with other countries in the world unless we reform our education system. Much of what President Clinton proposes as stimulus is an investment in education. Build the infrastructure, and invest in education, that invests in this country's future.

On trade, what the President is saying is radical to some, but very simple to me. He simply says to other countries, send your goods here; they are welcome to be sold in our country because we want our consumers to have a wide range of choices, but we only expect one thing from you. We expect when you send your goods here, you open your markets to us. That is what we expect. It is what we deserve.

We have not for a long, long while had someone stand up for the economic interests of the American producer. And I frankly am sick and tired of a trade policy that fundamentally gives in and says we do not care; ship your goods to us, but close your markets to us.

That is a trade policy which is bankrupting this country. It is unfair to American producers, unfair to American workers, and fundamentally unfair to this country. It is darned well

time we had a trade policy that insists on trade fairness. I am talking about the Canadian trade agreement which sold out American farmers, the Mexican agreement which will also sell out many American farmers, and many other trade agreements in which we simply do not have fair trade.

President Clinton is asking for change in economic policy, in trade policy, in education, and health care. I listened to this debate, and much of it was very instructive and very good, but some of it was just the same tired chorus of an old song that everybody knows, but does not harmonize at all in this country.

This country is not moving ahead. It can and it will, but it is not. And it will not until we pass a bill that represents fundamental economic change to move in a different direction; invest in people; deal with the deficits in a real way; fix our education system; fix our health care system; and insist on fair trade. When we do that, this country will get up in the morning and feel good about itself and say we are the biggest, the best, the strongest, with the most; we can compete anywhere in the world, and do well.

That is what President Clinton asks of us. We can in 100 ways and in 100 days describe why this is all wrong. I understand that technique. I have used it I suppose from time to time in my career. But what is the alternative? It is to keep doing what we have always done. And what has that gotten us the last 12 years? In a whole mess of economic trouble.

President Clinton has sent down here a ladder, why not try and pull ourselves up?

It will take a little courage. I would prefer not to vote for any taxes. Heck, I would like that. But, I am willing to vote for some taxes that the people who I represent do not like, because I think that we all need to risk our jobs in order to fix what is wrong in this country.

I have a little boy in kindergarten named Brendan. His sister Haley is 3. On his first day of kindergarten we were talking to Haley and Brendan about what he was going to learn.

We told Haley: "Brandon is going to learn to read in kindergarten."

He came home the first evening, and Haley was waiting for him with a book. She handed him the book, and she said, "Read this."

Well, that's the way a lot of people in this country think, and a lot of people in this Chamber think—instant results. This is the land of instant coffee, instant pudding, Jiffy Lube, and the quick fix.

This is a very tough problem, and it is not going to be solved overnight. This is going to take a lot of courage and a lot of time and a lot of diligence by good people who are willing to risk their careers.

But as tough as the problem is, I am convinced that tomorrow is going to be better than today if we all decide to put aside all the partisan differences and climb our way out of the economic hole. Let's get behind this President, fix what is wrong in this country, and move ahead.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania 15 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, in addressing the pending amendment by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], it is the sense of the Senate that any increase in revenues does not assume an energy tax on non-conventional fuels. It may be that Senator WELLSTONE's amendment does not go far enough in prohibiting any energy tax at all. I had hoped to have made these points earlier in the debate, but our schedules here are very complicated. This is the first opportunity I have had to seek the floor to raise my concern about the scope of the tax increases.

In citing statistics, I am always concerned as to their accuracy, being primarily trained for a courtroom where you have to have authentic evidence. But I am advised that taxes in the United States will grow from \$1.143 trillion this year to \$1.406 trillion in 1998; and that the cost of the energy tax on coal, illustratively, will be \$5.35 per ton, or an increase of some 26 percent, with the National Coal Association estimating that the tax would increase the average electric generator fuel cost by about 17 percent—which is an enormous consumers' increase—whereas the administration projects a homeowners' electric bill increase of only 3 percent.

In citing this wide variance, I note again my concern as to the accuracy of the statistics. But as I have reviewed the facts and figures, Madam President, I am led to the inevitable conclusion that the energy tax is a tax on lower- and middle-income families. Half of the new energy tax, I am advised, will be paid by families with less than \$50,000 in income; and the lowest-income, elderly families will see their taxes go up by some 45 percent due to the energy tax. The Congressional Budget Office reports that 17 percent—or \$5.5 billion of the total tax increase of \$32 billion over 5 years—17 percent will be paid by elderly with incomes under \$50,000 a year, which is a very alarming statistic.

The statistics available to me show that there will be an increase in the gasoline tax of 7.5 cents a gallon; an in-

crease in home heating oil of 8.3 cents a gallon; an increase in natural gas of 26 cents per gallon, cf. Three-quarters of energy is consumed by manufacturing, agriculture, and transportation. So that the Btu tax really becomes a tax on manufacturing, agriculture, and transportation, which will hit very heavily on the key group of States, one of which is my State of Pennsylvania.

Madam President, I said both publicly and privately that this Senator wants to support President Clinton in solving the problems of the country.

I know that the American people are fed up with gridlock. I said on this Senator floor in November 1991 that unless action was taken at that time—I took the floor and urged the cancellation of the December 1991 and January 1992 recesses—there would be 537 people looking for new work: 435 in the House; 100 in the Senate; and two others—the President and Vice President.

But wanting to cooperate does not mean a blank check. I am enormously concerned with the tax increases. I have introduced a sense-of-the-Congress resolution which I intend to press further on in the debate on this budget resolution. It is my belief there ought not to be any tax increases at all until every last effort is made to cut expenses and to eliminate unnecessary programs.

In 1990, when the new budget arrangement was under consideration, I conducted a series of open-house town meetings and found almost a uniform view—certainly at least a consensus—that people were prepared to pay new taxes if, and only if, they went exclusively for deficit reduction. I believe that any increase in taxes, including the energy tax, has to be calculated in that way.

Madam President, I do not conduct polls to reflect my own position. But I think it is not irrelevant to note that of the 4,000 letters which this Senator has received from February 18 until today, on the President's budget proposal they are running almost 10 to 1 against the President's proposals as to taxes. Further my district offices in Scranton, Allentown, Harrisburg, Erie, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia, has received some 1,721 callers against the President's proposals, with emphasis on the taxes, and 295 in favor.

I think it informative, Madam President, to cite a few of the letters which I have received as illustrations, one dated February 18 from Mr. Bruce P. Bengtson, of Maier's Bakery in Reading, PA, where he writes that he and his brother are president and executive vice president of a family-owned subchapter S corporation. He points out:

Being a subchapter S corporation, any excess of receipts over expenditures from the business is treated as part of our personal income therefore pushes us into the category which you have defined as "the rich," a group you categorically castigated in your radio address of Saturday, February 6, as

"those who got the most and gave the least during the past 12 years."

This letter is being written to President Clinton with a copy to this Senator.

The letter goes on to point out that: Your proposal—

Referring to the President's proposal—

Would increase our taxes by 20 percent, would cause us to significantly scale back the reinvestment program in our business, and would seriously cripple our efforts to become technologically state-of-the-art.

A similar letter which I received from Robert E. Murray, of Energy Resources, Inc., a company from Brockway, PA, recites that the proposed energy tax of the Clinton-Gore administration would be cataclysmic for Pennsylvania. And I point out that:

We will encounter a 12 percent electric rate increase for every Pennsylvania household, individual on fixed income, and every factory that depends on our electricity and which has a product that must compete with other States and foreign countries.

He goes on to note the devastating impact on steel and metal industries.

Further, it notes that Research Data International is projecting that the proposed energy tax will reduce the Nation's gross domestic product by at least \$170 billion, and will eliminate a minimum of 600,000 American jobs. Those remarks from two relatively small companies were echoed by the letter from Charles A. Corry, president of USX, one of the Nation's biggest companies, where Mr. Corry, in writing to the President, again sending a copy to this Senator, noted that: "All energy taxes are disproportionate in their effect."

He points out that "it would be unfair to attempt to balance the budget through any energy tax scheme, since each tax option under construction effectively picks winners and losers." And he goes on to point out that the devastating effect that the energy tax would have on the steel and oil businesses, which are prominent in USX's repertoire.

From those companies, Madam President, to a letter from an individual, William L. Snyder from Wyomissing, PA, who notes that he is a retiree, whose income falls into the \$30,000 to \$50,000 category. Then he states:

I'm willing to pay my fair share, but this is not fair. This is too much to throw at an income group for whom the President promised no increase in taxes.

In a similar letter from a Mr. Richard Faber of Blue Bell, PA, who notes that he and his wife are senior citizens, 66 and 67, with a taxable income of \$48,000. He points out:

In reviewing the case studies above, I am at a loss in trying to understand how or where these case studies represent "fairness."

Please do not support this inequitable part of the Clinton proposal.

In a similar letter of Miss Grace Meehan from Philadelphia, who points

out that being single and earning under \$30,000, 75 percent of her income goes to overhead. In her letter she states,

If we can cut Government spending, it might be worth increased taxes if Government used the money to lower the deficit, and not spend it on additional or current programs.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the preceding letters be printed in the RECORD, along with a letter from Miss Rosella Bianco, who writes about concerns for taxes on people in middle income, and also Mr. Thomas Ways, who makes the same point in a letter dated February 21.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY RESOURCES, INC.,
Brockway, PA, March 1, 1993.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: The proposed energy tax of the Clinton/Gore Administration, which is to be levied on a heat content, or BTU, basis, will result in disastrous economic consequences and job losses for Pennsylvania. The Administration states that the BTU tax has been selected because the cost burden thereof will be fairly distributed among all regions of the Country, but this assertion is totally false.

This is because the vast majority of Pennsylvania's electricity is produced from coal. The proposed tax targets coal, which costs only about one-third the price of natural gas on a BTU basis, more than any other fuel. The weighted average price increase nationally under this proposed tax would be 17.66 percent for coal, 17.70 percent for oil, and only 11.07 percent for natural gas.

But, the adverse impact on the citizens of Pennsylvania will be much greater. This is because Pennsylvania's coal has a higher heat, or BTU, content, but lower price, due to its high sulfur content and/or low mining costs and demand. Thus, any tax levied on a heat, or BTU, basis will place a disproportionately high economic burden on Pennsylvanians.

For example, Energy Resources, Inc. currently sells its 12,500 BTU/lb. coal to the State's electric utilities for about \$22.00 per ton. The proposed 25.7¢ per million BTU tax amounts to a \$6.43 per ton, or twenty-nine percent (29 percent), increase in the cost of coal. Since about forty percent (40 percent) of the cost of electricity is the coal fuel, using our coal we will encounter a twelve percent (12 percent) electric rate increase for every Pennsylvania household, individual on fixed income, and every factory that depends on our electricity and which has a product that must compete with other states and foreign countries. Pennsylvania's steel and other metal industries, for instance, which already have difficulty in competing with foreign countries, will be particularly hard hit by this ill-conceived energy tax.

The prestigious research group of Research Data International has projected that the proposed Clinton/Gore energy tax will reduce the Nation's gross domestic product by at least \$170 billion, more than the amount of revenue that the government will collect, and will eliminate a minimum of 600,000 American jobs. We are certain that a disproportionately high number of these jobs will be lost in Pennsylvania's mines and factories. The resulting decrease in economic

activity will also produce lower collections of individual income, social security, and corporate taxes. This proposed tax will raise the price of every consumer item that requires energy in its production, manufacturing, or transportation.

It will disproportionately hurt the poor and place yet another burden on middle income families. You will recall that, when the organization of petroleum export companies raised the price of oil in the mid-1970's, both inflation and unemployment drastically increased.

On behalf of our employees at Energy Resources and the additional indirect jobs that depend on the survival of our Company and Mines, we urge you to exhaust all efforts in the Congress to defeat any kind of energy tax, with those based on heat, or BTU, or carbon, being the most damaging to Pennsylvania.

We will be pleased to meet with you or provide additional information on the insidiously flawed Clinton/Gore energy tax at your convenience. All Pennsylvanians urgently need your help!

Sincerely,

ENERGY RESOURCES, INC.,
ROBERT E. MURRAY,
Shareholder.

MAIER'S, THE BAKER OF BREADS,
Reading, PA, February 18, 1993.

Senator ARLEN SPECTER,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: Enclosed find copy of a letter I have sent to President Clinton. I enclose it for your information and ask you to vote against a tax increase, not only because of its negative effect on our business, but also because of the negative effect of a tax increase on the country's shaky economy emerging from the recession induced by the last tax increase of 1990.

Our business needs increased after-tax income to finance the investments we must make to become state-of-the-art and remain competitive, so we may protect the jobs we have created and, hopefully, create more.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BRUCE P. BENGTON.

MAIER'S, THE BAKER OF BREADS,
Reading, PA, February 18, 1993.

President CLINTON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: My brother-in-law and I are President and Executive Vice President, respectively, of the family-owned sub-chapter S corporation on whose stationery I am writing. At the time we began our work with this company, it consisted of a single plant employing approximately 250 people and generating about \$7 million in annual sales. Within about five years, as a defensive move to remain in business, we acquired two other bakeries, more than doubling our size and number of employees. Since then, through our work and efforts and that of our management team, we have been able to expand to 1,050 employees and a level of sales about 12 times that when we began.

We are a small capitalization company, having only about 1/4 the capital of a so-called average small-capitalization company. We are too big to qualify for SBA loans and too small to issue our own commercial paper. The jobs we have succeeded in creating in the intervening years have not been minimum-wage jobs, but have been what your Secretary of Labor calls "well-paying jobs," generating wages in the \$12-\$15 an hour bracket. We are in a very basic, highly-

competitive business where a few pennies a loaf can make the difference between a profit and a loss for the year.

Being a sub-chapter S corporation, any excess of receipts over expenditures from the business is treated as part of our personal income and therefore pushes us into the category which you have defined as "the rich," a group you categorically castigated in your radio address of Saturday, February 6th as "those who got the most and gave the least during the past 12 years."

After I stopped smarting in anger at being so labelled after all our work of the past 12 years, my more rational self began to think: "Perhaps President Clinton doesn't realize all the ramifications of his tax proposal. He says he's interested in creating well-paying jobs. We have created well-paying jobs over the last 12 years. Perhaps he doesn't realize that we and others like us, pushed into higher brackets by virtue of the earnings of our business, are the targets of his proposed tax on 'the rich.' Surely he does not mean to impose a punitive tax on us when we are plowing back the after-tax proceeds of our business into machinery and equipment replacements and upgrades in an attempt to become state-of-the-art so we can continue to support the well-paying jobs we have created and, hopefully, create more of them. That would not be consistent with his stated objectives."

Your proposal would increase our taxes by 20 percent, would cause us to significantly scale back the reinvestment program in our business, and would seriously cripple our efforts to become technologically state-of-the-art. Example: We just replaced a 41-year-old bread mixer in our Easton plant, but it cost over \$250,000. We need more internally-generated capital provided by after-tax earnings to invest in our business, not less. In a business as cost competitive as ours, there is no way we can pass a tax increase of that magnitude on to the consumers of our product and expect to remain competitive on the store shelves.

Mr. President, what we need is not a tax increase on those like us who are pushed into the category you call "the rich" by existing tax laws, but rather Federal spending decreases to move toward a balanced Federal budget. We need a reinstatement of the investment tax credit to help us with our reinvestment and job-creation program rather than a punitive income tax hike to cripple our reinvestment efforts.

Your tax proposal's impact on our salaries is not the issue. Your tax proposal's impact on our business and our ability to reinvest and create more jobs is the issue. I strongly urge you to reconsider all the ramifications of your proposal. If we and others like us are able to continue to grow and prosper, creating more jobs for tax-paying citizens in the process, the resulting tax revenues will substantially outweigh any revenue dollars you might generate by this extremely unwise proposed tax increase.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BRUCE P. BENGTON.

USX CORP.,
Pittsburgh, PA, February 8, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of the announcement of your proposed economic growth and deficit reduction plan, I would like to offer an assessment of the energy tax components currently under consideration. As the chief executive of a corporation en-

gaged in basic manufacturing and energy production, I believe the perspective I offer is unique and hope my comments will be of assistance to you in your effort to create jobs and stimulate economic growth.

The goal you have established for your Administration, halving the federal budget deficit by 1997, is both laudable and essential. The deficit is an albatross to our nation's long term economic competitiveness and must be eliminated. As you have often stated, however, the measures required to achieve a balanced budget should be broadly applied and any sacrifice must be shared.

Although we may disagree on the necessity of raising federal revenues at this time, I will not discuss my general opposition to increased taxes. Rather, I urge you to avoid falling into the trap of thinking energy taxes are equitable or in the best long-term interest of our economy.

All energy taxes are disproportionate in their effect. It is a simple fact that some industries use more energy than others. Likewise, the type of energy used by various consumers varies greatly. It would be unfair to attempt to balance the budget through any energy tax scheme, since each tax option under consideration effectively picks winners and losers. An energy tax might be characterized by some as a tax on consumption, but it is an even bigger tax on production. All industry in the United States runs on energy. Inexpensive energy is key to our international competitive advantage and taxing it will have a dampening effect on the entire economy. If a "broad-based" energy tax is enacted, the American manufacturing sector, and its workers, pensioners, and customers will be the losers. Our foreign competitors who are by and large exempt from their governments' energy taxes will be the winners.

The environmental benefits of an energy tax are overstated and misleading. While the environmental community is propounding the alleged conservation virtues of an energy tax, the truth is that the market already rewards conservation and penalizes excess energy consumption. Existing law, such as the recently enacted Clean Air Act, for instance, now requires industry to make substantial investments in environmental improvement. These investments are a form of taxation that has been felt heavily in the manufacturing sector—especially in the oil and steel business. For several years now, USX, like many other corporations, has been engaged in costly, multi-year investment programs (at a great tax disadvantage) in order to meet new federal pollution standards. This existing burden must be considered before it is compounded by new, direct energy taxes.

Economic growth, investment, and job creation must not be undermined in the zeal to reduce the deficit. It is difficult to achieve a balance between thrusting the economy back into recession and reducing the deficit. The relatively small pool of available capital will either be claimed by the federal treasury or reinvested in the private sector. This is especially true in our beleaguered manufacturing sector. The economic effects of any large energy tax could well prove counterproductive to your Administration's broader economic goals by resulting in increased unemployment, lower investment in new plant and equipment, reduced exports due to higher costs of production, and inflation. A "broad-based" energy tax would be the most disruptive and unpredictable force to inject into our current deficit reduction/economic growth predicament and it would be devastating to our industrial base.

Mr. President, our nation's industrial base, perhaps the entire U.S. economy, is at an historic crossroads. For too long, our government has pursued tax, trade, and regulatory policies that disadvantage our ability to manufacture domestically and compete internationally. As you prepare to lead America into the 21st century, please ask yourself and your Administration to consider where industrial capacity fits in our nation's future. If you conclude as I do that a vital manufacturing base is essential for continued prosperity and security, then an economic program that encourages investment and growth must be pursued.

Yours very truly,

C.A. CORRY.

Wyomissing, PA, February 23, 1993.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,

Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I'm a retiree whose income, with Social Security, falls into the \$30-50,000 category. The attached article indicates the average tax increase in this range will be \$204 per year. I estimated my 1992 taxes based on the forecast 85% tax rate on Social Security, as opposed to the current 50%. My taxes would have gone up \$980! At this rate, I'll be giving back more than \$1,000 of my Social Security income in 1993. With the estimated \$204, this is a \$1,200 increase.

I'm willing to pay my fair share, but this is not fair. This is too much to throw at an income group for whom the President had promised no increase in taxes.

In the middle income tax range, no one else is expected to pay an increase on their income, except those on Social Security.

I am asking you, as my Senator in Congress, to vote against an increase in the percentage of Social Security payments to be taxed.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM L. SNYDER.

TRANSCRIPT OF RICHARD FABER'S LETTER

Blue Bell, PA, February 19, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: My wife and I are retired senior citizens (ages 67 and 66). Our income consists of my pension from my former employer, investment income and social security (taxable income for 1992, line 37 of Form 1040 of \$48,000).

Please note that net tax increase under the Clinton proposal for the retired couple as calculated and shown above. Our next increase will be even more because our income is higher.

In reviewing the case studies above, I am at a loss in trying to understand how or where these case studies represent "fairness".

Please do not support this inequitable part of the Clinton proposal. Certainly a modification is in order.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD FABER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 1, 1993.

Senator ARLEN SPECTER,
Philadelphia, PA.

DEAR SIR: Over the past several years, I have become increasingly concerned about government spending. After listening to President Clinton's State of the Union address, I am determined to become more knowledgeable about how my tax dollars are being spent.

I was unemployed for 18 months, searching for a full time position in Washington, DC, Virginia, Maryland, etc. (By the way I never

applied for unemployment. Instead I choose to work part time for \$5/hour and cash in my IRA. Unemployment was to be a last resort.) I was fortunate to finally gain a position in Philadelphia. I'm single, making under \$30,000, spending nearly 40% of my pay for rent for a small apartment in Center City, paying \$200 a month to pay off credit card bills (primarily used for expensive doctor appointments and prescription medication when I was unemployed), car payments and car insurance. I drive my car on the weekends and park it in Center City. For this privilege, I pay approximately \$1300 per year on insurance for a car that is rated low in auto theft/loss. Over 75% of my income goes to "overhead". This does not include groceries, utilities, clothing, transportation to/from work, gasoline, medication, etc.

I am reviewing my income and spending habits and am considering picking up a job on the weekends as well as refinancing my auto loan to lower my monthly debt.

So obviously, I'm concerned about higher taxes. I paid the city of Philadelphia over \$1100 in taxes, the Commonwealth of PA and VA, Social Security, Federal taxes as well as state, city and local sales taxes. I don't have any children, so I won't be getting any earned income tax break. But if we can cut government spending, it might be worth increased taxes if government used the money to lower the deficit, and not spend it on additional or current programs.

My job (as an advertising media planner) is to work within a given budget, track that budget and make certain that the client does not overspend. At the same time providing my client with the most effective means of advertising the company's product.

Since I work within budgets at my job, I want to try my hand at balancing the Federal Budget. You see, my job has trained me to analyze data impartially; and to look at the big picture as well as the small. I have no hidden agendas, no pork barrel pet projects, no one lobbying me, and I ask if the item passes the common sense test. In other words, I feel that I can bring objectivity to the project.

So, I would like your assistance. I would like for you to forward to me a copy of the President's economic plan to include the specific tax increases as well as the specific budget cuts. Also, please forward a copy of the Congressional Budget Report that is being used as the "official" budget document. (Bill wants specific cuts, I'll find him specific cuts.)

Personally? Without Line Item Veto and Balanced Budget Amendment, the deficit is only going to grow. Funny he did not mention that during the State of the Union address. How come? Is he afraid to make himself and his fellow democrats look bad when they refuse to give it to him? Afraid to show the American people that when it comes down to brass tacks, he can't move the Congress either? These two items are the key to lowering the deficit. By the way, what ever happened to the Gramm-Rudman Act?

I don't think Congress is capable of making the hard decisions. So I am going to do it for them.

Thank you for your time.

GRACE MEEHAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

February 24, 1993.

President BILL CLINTON,

White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT: I am writing to you to appeal to your conscience and straight thinking which I know you are capable of using.

You have suggested that social security benefits should be taxed at 85% of income in place of the present 50%. But when you were campaigning you stated that you would not tax the middle class American which you stated was an income of \$40,000 a year. But you are proposing this tax on social security recipients making \$25,000/\$32,000 which is below the middle class income.

You stated that the upper income bracket of \$160,000 would be taxed but not the middle class of \$40,000, but you propose taxing social security recipients at \$25,000 for single people and \$32,000 for married couples.

You surely do not think \$25,000 income represents a rich person!! Our senior citizens worked hard and saved for their retirement and even the government encouraged them to do so with I.R.A.'s. These people who were raised during the deep depression learned to live on less and save because they knew what it was to have nothing. They were afraid to retire with nothing for medical expenses, etc. And in this present society people cannot depend on their children to take them into their home and care for them when they are old! In my generation we took our grandparents/parents into our homes and cared for them but that is not true now, we have to have sufficient money saved to go into a nursing home which is expensive!

You have asked how you can cut and I am telling you what to cut: cut out the space program which is a waste of my tax money in my estimation; cut out the large pensions of our former presidents and their expense accounts, etc.; cut out all the fancy parties at the White House; cut your salary and all the senators, congressmen and their expense accounts and you will probably balance the deficit.

I am sure you know what I am talking about—you and your wife were activists during your years in college—I am sure you can empathize with our senior citizens now!

Please do not turn against those who voted for you. You came out for the "gays" because they voted for you and you promised to help them—so do not forget the people who built America—the senior citizens!

Social Security should have never been taxed, but Pres. Reagan did just that and now you are adding insult to injury by raising the tax. If you feel that you have to include social security in your attempt to cut the deficit, you should not tax any social recipient who has an income under \$40,000 which is the middle class income according to your statement.

Please do me the courtesy of answering my letter.

Sincerely,

ROSELLA BIANCO.

THOM & CHARLOTTE WAYS,

Wexford, PA, February 21, 1993.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,

Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I have tried to carefully review President Clinton's proposals for solving the economic problems that beset our nation. [I am in agreement that all Americans should be willing to sacrifice to reduce the national debt and give our children a better future. However, in looking at the program presented I fear I find the same old tax and spend strategy being "sold" to us. I am asking that you oppose any tax increase before dramatic cuts are made across the board in all federal programs. As a matter of fact, I would propose that Congress enact a law that any tax increase must be used to reduce the deficit. No new spending programs should be enacted without corresponding cuts in other programs to fund them.]

With the burden of federal, state and local taxes increasing at a dramatic rate we will soon reach the point where our only recourse will be to remove all current representatives and vote in people who will finally face facts and take unpopular (to special interests) stances on entitlements.

Senator, I look to you to stand firm in the face of the liberal democratic forces and do the right thing for those of us who kept the faith and voted for you to represent us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS WAYS,
Member of Council,
Franklin Park Borough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BURNS. How much time do we have remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining on his side.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I yield myself as much time in that 15 minutes as I might take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I will be offering Monday or Tuesday an amendment exempting the off-road fuel tax out of the Btu tax as submitted by this resolution.

It is interesting to hear those who represent farm States as we take a look and see what is in this package and how it is packaged and how it will impact our No. 1 industry, especially in the State of Montana.

In 1991, farmers and others consumed 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline and some 2.8 billion gallons of diesel fuel in off-road uses. That is our tractors, our combines, our balers, in other words, everything it takes to keep a farm or ranch rolling.

Farmers are price takers. They cannot pass those added costs along. They cannot send it so it increases the prices of food in grocery stores on down the line. They are unable to do that, because they operate with a raw product on a commodity market. In fact, farmers are at the end of the line. They buy retail, sell wholesale, and pay the freight both ways. It is an industry that has been like that. We are not saying that is bad. That is just the way it is.

But here is a tax that is placed on them that they cannot pass along and they cannot write it off of their income tax. It is there for them to pay and they get no tax credits at all for that. They will pay it and cannot pass it along.

I do not think there has been a lot of farms and ranches that have been too profitable since about 1981 or 1982. I am an auctioneer. I sold out a lot of good friends in the mid-1980's when the heartland was really hurting and when you went and sold a friend out and sometimes you did not get any com-

mission because if you had taken the commission that is the only money that they would have had whenever they moved off the farm.

If you do not think food production is not a tenuous thing, I will offer a little example. Friday night they forecasted a big storm here on the east coast. Everyone went to the grocery stores. They closed the grocery stores at 10 o'clock because they sold out.

There are 60 days of food in the pipeline for this society to feed and clothe a society, food and fiber, and farmers and ranchers are the fifth largest user of energy in this country.

When you come from a State that is not only an energy producer, but also an energy consumer, with longer winters, driving longer spaces, covering more miles—you know, in 30 minutes you can be across three States in the East; in 30 minutes we are not even out of the lane. If you measured it as a crow flies from Eureka, MT, to Alzada, MT, it is farther than Chicago to Washington, DC.

And you are going to tell me this is fair. I have to take exception to that, because it is not fair.

So, we are asked to absorb this cost without the ability to pass it along.

Consumers in this country dictate food prices through the food processing industry, and it is highly competitive. We know who is going to pay the difference.

So, with that, we will offer that amendment. We will also offer the amendment to exempt diesel fuel from the Btu tax. Those two amendments will be coming from us on Monday.

They all have very, very high overhead. Those folks representing farm States say, "Yes, I can pass a sense of the Senate. We are still going to support the President's package."

We all know what a sense of the Senate is. It is not doing anything, and you are sent here to represent a farm State and those people. I mean these are the people who have the callouses on their hands. They are starting to plant crops. They are starting to pull out the machinery, getting ready to plant another crop and harvest another crop, to be the No. 1 producer in the State of Washington, as it is in Montana, the largest industry.

You are asking those people who have these callouses on their hands and also the people that sign the checks on both sides to absorb this cost to be fair and still ask to produce food and fiber for this society.

They already pay more than their share. If you want to figure up what they pay in real estate taxes, sales taxes, and we do not get depreciation anymore, do not get investment tax credits. We are still asked to produce.

We were getting \$3 for wheat in 1948. We are only getting \$2.75 right now. A pound loaf of bread has 6 cents worth of wheat in it—6 cents.

How long can you ask that man, who is the most productive and most efficient man in the world, to do this and still absorb 8 cents a gallon gas and 7 cents on diesel? You are asking him to absorb that without any way of passing that along.

I guess we might as well go back and start farming with horses again. That is OK with me. I just lost my father back in December. That is the way he farmed.

If you want to talk about bad times, you say this is a bad time, if you want to talk about the 1950's any gray hair around here will remember the fifties and farm prices in the fifties, early fifties, or do you want to talk about the thirties? My dad on 140 acres of two rocks and one dirt his gross income was \$28.70 in 1933. You think we are in bad times, when the majority of the people in this body spent more than that just to drive to work this morning. I know they spent more than that on their hotel and motel and their lunch.

So, what are we asking? What are we asking when we have an economy that is starting to grow? We are going to say: No. We are going to tax you, and the Government is going to provide the jobs.

I do not believe that, and I do not think the American people believe it either.

Now, let us get two terms here. There is a deficit and deficit is what we spend over what we take in. We deficit spend but we accumulate debt at the end.

At the end of this, if it all went through, if the President's plan was signed right now, we will have accumulated, in the next 4 years, \$1 trillion more debt. We will have put that on our children and our grandchildren—\$1 trillion more. It will be up around \$5 trillion. That is what the debt will be.

So we have not addressed the debt. We have not done anything about the debt. And if you look at the fifth year, as far as deficit spending is concerned, that rises. It just balloons, goes right off the map.

So let us not hoodwink the American people into saying that this is the answer or we are off in a new direction. I believe we are off in a new direction—the wrong one.

Let us let small businessmen make a profit. Let us let our agriculturalists make a profit. And that is where we are going to get our jobs. Two out of three jobs created in this country will come from small business. Two out of three new first jobs comes from small business. It does not come from Government. It comes from small business.

The only reason they go into business is there is a chance for profit. We have new opportunities in agriculture, and I really believe that. I think we have so many opportunities out there. But we are not going to be allowed to develop those opportunities if we have

more taxes and we have to fork it over to Uncle Sam in a massive transfer of wealth.

I do not think that is fair; when you are asking the most efficient industry in the world to carry the load, and that is food and fiber. And do you know why they chose to tax there? Because it is renewable. It comes every year. Every year it comes. It grows up.

We harvest it and we tax it. That does not help feed people. That does not help clothe people. But it is renewable and it is wonderful in this great United States of America. It is about the only country in the world where we can have fresh lettuce and fresh carrots in the Northern Hemisphere all winter long. Did you know that? No other country in the world can do that. The distribution and processing system is the best in the world.

The Chair knows that. She comes from California, the leading agricultural State in this Union, as long as they get water; and they are getting water, and we watch that very closely.

So what we are saying here is, let us take a look at this in common sense. Those are the two amendments that I will be offering.

And when we start talking about Btu, let us change that from British thermal units to we better tighten up. Because it is coming, America. They are going to get your money. And they are going to get it hidden. They are not going to get it where you can see it. You are going to pay it, whether you like it or not.

Madam President, I will be offering those amendments on Monday or Tuesday to be voted on.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I commend President Clinton for his prompt follow through on his promise to change America, and I strongly support this resolution endorsing one of the central elements of his "Vision of Change for America"—the promotion of the use of renewable, environmentally benign, and domestically produced energy sources.

After 12 years of a rudderless energy policy, President Clinton is offering America a fresh approach. Last month, the President spelled out that approach in plain language when he announced that, "the administration will launch initiatives to develop new, clean, renewable energy sources that cost less and preserve the environment."

The President is absolutely correct in promoting environmentally benign energy sources. This resolution reinforces the President's vision by urging that fuels like ethanol, which are renewable, clean, and environmentally benign, be encouraged over fuels that are not.

The promotion of domestically produced ethanol is particularly well-founded, because it contributes to the achievement of three of the President's top goals—environmental protection, job creation, and deficit reduction.

First, ethanol is an environmentally advantageous fuel. Ethanol blends reduce ozone forming carbon monoxide emissions by up to 25 percent and displace up to 10 percent of the benzene, lead, and other toxic and ozone-forming elements of base gasoline. Ethanol is also one of the few motor vehicle fuels we use that actually reduce the greenhouse gas CO₂, according to the highly respected Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Second, ethanol development creates good jobs here in America. Nothing is more central to this administration than the interrelationship between job creation and environmental protection, and ethanol provides one of the most dramatic success stories in this regard. The American ethanol industry not only has helped clear up the air, it has used more than 350 million bushels of corn every year, providing an additional 25 cents per bushel of corn sold in rural America.

Pure and simple, ethanol is one of the most effective ways we have found to improve farm income, create jobs, and stabilize rural economies. For every 100 million new gallons in production, 5,000 new jobs are created in rural America. Moreover, substituting over 900 million gallons of imported oil, methanol, or MTBE with domestically produced ethanol creates jobs here at home and improves our national trade balance and energy security outlook.

Finally, the administration is correctly placing a high priority on deficit reduction, and here, too, ethanol plays a constructive role. According to the General Accounting Office, the ethanol program saves the Government as much as \$560 million every year in reduced farm program costs and increased rural economic development. And, speaking of subsidies, the last time I checked ethanol did not require a multibillion-dollar military tanker escort or a full-scale war to ensure its safe delivery to market from South Dakota.

So, any way you look at it, encouraging the use of ethanol fits the Clinton-Gore vision for America. We are wise to support that vision.

There may be some in this Chamber whose rhetoric in this debate is aimed primarily at scoring cheap political points back home. That would be unfortunate.

The fact of the matter is that the administration has not yet finalized the details of how the Btu tax will be implemented. Furthermore, everything we know about President Clinton's past record as a Governor and vision for the future suggests that ethanol will play a central role in his administration's environmental and energy policies.

So, as one who has long championed the development of a viable and expanding domestic ethanol industry,

and who authored the law to extend the solar, geothermal, and ocean thermal tax credits, I compliment the President on his commitment to the development and promotion of renewable energy sources, strongly support treating all renewables the same under the proposed Btu tax, and urge adoption of the pending resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, it is unfortunate we have to engage in this type of amendment; it is unfortunate we did not vote to get rid of this hideous tax last night. But now, just hours after my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to impose the Clinton Btu tax on just about every type of fuel and on every American using those fuels, we are deciding that proposal was wrong, that ethanol should be exempt.

I am in favor of the Wellstone amendment, but I am against the need for the Wellstone amendment—the Btu tax. This small exemption is not going to solve the problems in rural America that will come from the Btu tax. Farmers will still have their taxes increased by hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars each year. Those living in big cities or the suburbs will not have to pay that much. Why? Why did the Democrats vote to increase taxes on farmers by thousands of dollars and not on residents of urban areas? And why did they vote to impose higher taxes on those living in the Northeast, who heat their homes with oil, than they did on those who live in some other area where a choice of heating fuels is available to consumers? Why the geographic warfare; what is the purpose?

Madam President, we will provide our colleagues an opportunity to make other small corrections in the Clinton Btu tax. There should be, no doubt, an exemption for farmers and for heating oil. We should also decide whether to exempt the poor and the elderly. We should vote on whether our cash-strapped States and municipalities should be exempt, and so on and so on.

So, we will have the opportunity to vote on these matters and attempt to correct a serious mistake we made last night to impose this tax. I, for one, am most grateful when I travel to my home State tonight, no one will ask me why I voted to impose this regressive new tax on the American people.

Mr. BURNS. I might inquire, how much time do I have remaining? I have 3 minutes remaining; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURNS. I will yield back the remainder of my time and yield at this time to the Senator from South Carolina.

I inquire of the Senator how much time he needs.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I have several matters I want to speak on. On this resolution, I will take about 9 or 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed on the resolution.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT TO PRECLUDE A FREEZE ON MILITARY PAY IN 1994 AND ANY FUTURE MODIFICATIONS TO THE CURRENT PAY RAISE FORMULA

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise today to discuss a matter of grave importance to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

On behalf of myself and Senator McCain, I will soon be introducing an amendment to the budget resolution. Our amendment will ensure the Department of Defense is adequately funded to allow Active and Reserve component military personnel to receive a pay increase for fiscal year 1994 and to ensure that military personnel pay increases for fiscal year 1995 through 1998, as established under current law, are not subject to additional reductions.

The President asked all Americans to sacrifice as we move forward together to reduce the budget deficit. I agree with his call for shared sacrifice, but I am concerned that our finest young men and women are being asked to bear an unfair burden while others are not.

Madam President, as we meet today, there are American servicemen and women serving proudly all around the world. They are putting their lives on the line in Somalia, Bosnia, Southwest Asia, and elsewhere, as part of United Nations efforts and in defense of the interests of the United States. These brave young Americans and their families are sacrificing every day. They are far from home, many are separated from their families. They are selflessly serving to keep America free and to keep our commitments and responsibilities as a world power.

Madam President, our great service men and women give more to the country, individually and as a group, than the vast majority of us who enjoy the comforts and freedom they provide. They do not ask the American people for much. More than anything, these young Americans want our respect and support. They want us to know they are out there and that we do not take them for granted.

What message do we send to these soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines when we virtually single them out and freeze their pay? How do we ask a young parent to leave his or her family and go protect our interests while freezing the pay which will provide for their family?

Madam President, historically, the adequacy of military pay raises has been measured against annual increases experienced by average Ameri-

cans, as measured by the Department of Labor's employment cost index. In the 1970's military pay shortfalls were identified as a major contributing factor to the reduced retention of skilled noncommissioned officers and to the hollow force. The Congress recognized this situation and approved full comparability catchup military pay raises in 1981 and 1982.

After several years of pay caps between 1983 and 1988, military pay raises have tracked closely with the employment cost index since 1989. The proposal before the Senate today will freeze military pay for fiscal year 1994 and limit raises to 1 percent below the normal statutory raise for fiscal years 1995 through 1998. What this means is that military pay raises after 1994 will be 1½ percent below the employment cost index.

Madam President, from 1982 to the present, military pay raises lagged behind private sector raises by almost 12 percent. The proposed freeze and pay raise limits will widen the gap to 20 percent. The administration has indicated they want to spare families earning less than \$30,000 annually. Over three-quarters of the enlisted service members earn less than \$30,000 per year. The proposed pay freeze and limits on future raises will result in greater sacrifices by this group than any other.

Because pay freezes and reduced raises compound, the proposal in the budget will impose lifelong penalties on our military personnel. It is inevitable that allowing military pay to slip below the national average will lead to recruiting problems, retention problems, and return to the hollow forces of the 1970's.

We now have an all-volunteer military which does everything we as a nation ask of them, and yet they ask for very little in return. As I said earlier, what they really want is our respect and support. I, for one, do not think freezing their pay is respectful or supportive.

Madam President, this amendment will add \$11 billion in budget authority and outlays to the recommended levels for national defense over 5 years. These funds only provide for continuing military pay raises under current law. It is not intended to increase any other program. In point of fact, over 5 years more than \$3 billion of the \$11 billion will go to the military pension account and will not leave the Treasury.

I hope we will not close our eyes to the lessons of the past. I hope we do not allow the current superb state of military readiness to erode and force high quality personnel to leave due to lack of support. I urge my colleagues to show their support for the men and women in our Armed Forces and vote for this amendment.

THE NICKLES AMENDMENT (NO. 182)

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, I rise in support of the Nickles amendment,

and urge my colleagues to lend their support to eliminating the discriminatory and regressive Btu tax.

The Clinton Btu tax will severely hurt New Hampshire consumers. A State-by-State ranking of the impact of this tax shows that New Hampshire consumers will be hit the fourth hardest in the Nation. Worse, New Hampshire and other New England States that depend on oil to heat homes during the cold winter are being asked to sacrifice—not for deficit reduction—but for more Government spending.

The Nickles amendment is simple. It says to the American people, "We will cut spending before we raise taxes." The Nickles amendment would eliminate the Btu tax, and make up the lost revenue by telling the Federal Government, "No new spending."

Candidate Clinton spent a great deal of time in New Hampshire last year. He told my middle-class constituents that he was going to cut—not raise—their taxes. Ironically, a vote for the Nickles amendment will put the President a little bit closer to his campaign promise.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent we go into morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, it was my understanding the time was going to be taken from the resolution?

Mr. THURMOND. I have about 6 minutes on this subject. Then I want to pay a tribute to Senator DOLE's brother who passed away recently. It will take about 6 minutes. I need about 5 minutes to pay a tribute to the Citadel on its sesquicentennial anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1994 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise today to discuss my general concerns regarding the President's economic plan and the proposed budget resolution.

One month ago, President Clinton unveiled what he described as a comprehensive economic plan for the Nation, "A Vision of Change for America." I commend him for putting forth

his plan. I am certainly ready to work with him to develop a significant, long-term economic plan to improve our Nation's well-being and to create new jobs.

However, we must be careful that we do not impair the recent improvements in our Nation's economy. For example, the economy grew 4.8 percent in the fourth quarter of last year, according to revised figures reported by the Commerce Department. This was the strongest quarterly growth rate in 5 years. In addition, the Labor Department recently reported that the unemployment rate has fallen to 7 percent and that productivity growth is at a 20-year high.

Finally, statistics of economic performance provide further evidence of a strong and growing economy. The index of leading economic indicators recently had the largest monthly gain in nearly a decade. Reported increases in housing starts, surges in sales of domestically built autos, and the rise in factory orders for durable goods all indicate the economy is improving.

I would like to emphasize that I am not arguing that our Nation is in perfect health and that further improvements are not necessary. Certainly the corporate restructuring and layoffs recently announced in the computer and aircraft industries and by retail giants is cause for concern. Additionally, there is great distress in many parts of the country, and especially in my own State, over potential military base closings and associated reductions in military and civilian employment. Nevertheless, the prescription should not be further taxation and deficit spending. These policies could impair the recent growth in our economy and further remove the capital required for private investment, job creation, market expansion, and sustained economic growth.

I would like to turn to the budget resolution. I must state my concern that we are proceeding on debate of a budget resolution without having the President's budget before us. The burden of production of a budget rests with the administration. However, Budget Committee hearings, presentation of committee views and estimates, even markup and reporting of the resolution itself have occurred without a budget before the Congress.

The budget resolution we are considering today calls for revenue increases of \$295 billion, one of the largest—if not the largest—tax increases in the history of our great Nation. I am extremely concerned that the resolution proposes such a large tax increase without further restraint in Government spending. Tax increases should be the measure of last resort.

The budget resolution places limitations on new budget authority and outlays by budget function. However, the resolution does not make real reduc-

tions in total Government spending or in the level of public debt. Total Government spending continues to increase each year under this plan. This increased spending and the accompanying annual deficits are projected to result in an increase in the national debt of nearly \$1.5 trillion.

There are some spending reductions in the plan. My concern is in the reshuffling of spending and where those reductions occur. For example, the plan proposes real and significant reductions for our national defense. I believe that in order to maintain the peace and to create an environment where reason can prevail, our Nation must maintain a credible force. However, reductions in planned spending for national defense is reduced over \$112 billion. This reduction is almost double the \$60 billion originally proposed by the administration.

Another area of real reduction is in agriculture. Careful review of the plan reveals a heavy burden placed on the agricultural and rural elements of our society. These areas have suffered greatly in recent years, and additional strain may have a detrimental impact on these fundamental areas of our Nation's society.

Nearly all other budget functions receive considerable increases in outlay authority. The health and Medicare functions nearly double over the 5 years of the budget plan. Outlays for education, training, employment, and social services also enjoy substantial growth. While these areas need assistance, we must be careful to ensure that Federal spending on these areas is cost effective.

In conclusion, let me comment on the path we are undertaking. We have a great opportunity to make significant strides toward doing what the people of this great Nation would have us do, as their elected representatives. The Nation wants to see its Congress and President work toward real reductions in Government spending, eliminate deficit spending, and reduce the public debt. However, there is no mandate for more Government programs, increased spending and debt, or higher taxes on all Americans.

As we proceed through these budget deliberations and the ensuing authorization and appropriation process, I hope that we can focus on the Nation's economy first. There is room for, and undoubtedly will be, genuine disagreement on some issues. Such disagreement is expected and even healthy in our form of government. I encourage each of my colleagues to seriously consider all proposals which may be offered during this debate on the budget resolution.

A TRIBUTE TO KENNY DOLE OF KANSAS

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I know I speak for all Members of the

Senate in extending our deepest sympathy to our Republican leader, Senator DOLE, on the passing of his brother, Kenny. There is a very special bond between brothers, and having recently lost a brother myself, I know the sorrow that is felt by Senator DOLE.

While I was not privileged to know Kenny Dole, I have heard Senator DOLE talk about him with great affection and pride on numerous occasions. While BOB came to Congress, Kenny remained in their home town of Russell, KS. An oil lease broker by trade, Kenny Dole was also a very public-spirited man, and he devoted countless hours to helping people. Upon Kenny's death, the former publisher of the Russell Daily News said "I don't even know the number of people he's helped and the things he's done for the community."

Kenny Dole never met a stranger, and, just like his brother, he could always be counted upon to spice up any conversation by his ability to make people laugh. He was also like his brother in his deep and abiding love for his country. Citizens in Russell will tell you that Kenny flew a flag on every patriotic occasion, and that his chest would swell with pride whenever he spoke of our Nation.

Kenny Dole was his brother's biggest supporter. He was a loving husband, father and grandfather, and a loyal and caring friend. Like his brother, Kenny Dole was committed to making a difference, and he did so in a personal and very special way. He will be deeply missed.

I extend my deepest condolences to our leader, for whom we all have the utmost affection and respect; to his lovely wife, Elizabeth, and the rest of his fine family. Our thoughts and prayers are with all of them in this time of sorrow.

THE SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITADEL

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my State's most unique and historic institutions, The Citadel, which is celebrating its sesquicentennial anniversary on March 20, 1993.

The South, and South Carolina in particular, has a long and distinguished tradition of patriotism and military service. From the War for American Independence to humanitarian efforts in Somalia, South Carolinians have proudly served in our Armed Forces and contributed to the defense of this Nation. The concept of the citizen-soldier is truly alive in South Carolina, especially on the grounds of The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina.

Though the school was established in 1842, The Citadel can trace its beginnings to 1780, when the residents of Charleston built a fortress to protect

the town from the British. The fortress became a State arsenal in 1822, and became officially known as The Citadel. It remained an arsenal until the State legislature passed an act in 1842 to establish a military college there. The following year, 20 cadets reported to The Citadel for instruction, beginning a tradition of excellence in education, service, and citizenship that has lasted 150 years.

The Citadel's mission has been to create whole men, individuals who will excel in any undertaking or profession. The college accomplishes this by creating an environment where undergraduates are challenged from the moment they step on campus and join the corps of cadets. For the next 4 years, each cadet is encouraged to develop his mind, body, and spirit through a number of activities. Cadets are required to take 4 years of Reserve Officer's Training Corps training and participate in athletic activities. Cadets also participate in NCAA Division I-AA sports. In fact, The Citadel won the Southern Conference championship in 1992.

Additionally, cadets are expected to maintain a commitment to academics and a high grade point average. The Citadel is consistently ranked as one of the best liberal arts colleges in the Nation, and it enjoys one of the highest graduation rates for athletes in the Nation. It also has the highest student graduation rate among public colleges and universities in South Carolina.

Madam President, as demanding as life at The Citadel may be, it is successful in producing bright, assertive, and well-rounded young men. The Citadel can proudly point to legions of graduates who have gone on to leadership positions in the military, government service, business, and almost every other walk of life.

From the arrival of the first cadets in 1843 to today, the Military College of South Carolina has served our State and Nation by molding whole men—men of valor, discipline, integrity, and honor.

The Citadel has grown from one city's fortress to one of our Nation's greatest bastions of academic endeavor. Madam President, I salute The Citadel on this important anniversary. I have no doubt it will continue to perform its vital mission for years to come.

Long live The Citadel.

THE NEW ELECTRIC RAILWAY JOURNAL

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, the publisher of the New Electric Railway Journal, Paul Weyrich, called my attention to a floor statement made by Senator PRYOR. Mr. Weyrich asked me to review the substance of Senator PRYOR's statement with a review and a response. He raised several concerns re-

garding the publication of the New Electric Railway Journal by the Free Congress Foundation, a nonprofit tax-exempt organization.

Because of my concern for inappropriate spending in these days of huge deficits, my interest was aroused by Senator PRYOR's statement and the media interest it generated in the Washington Post and on NBC News. So I decided to look into the matter of Federal funding for the journal.

Based on my review, I conclude that the Federal grant for this journal is a success story of Government funding. I want to share my findings with my colleagues so they may determine for themselves whether the project is worthwhile and has been successful.

According to information provided to me—again, I note the difficulty of absolute certainty, but I made my best efforts to be as sure as I can—the idea for the Journal arose in 1987 among interested parties at George Mason University under the Free Congress Foundation. The original Electric Railway Journal was published from 1908 to 1932 as the trade magazine of the interurban transportation trolley industries. As they went into decline, they were replaced by journals related to buses and other transportation modes.

With the revival of interest in electric railway, starting in 1980 with the opening of the San Diego trolley, the idea of starting a new trade journal arose. Dr. James Palmer, an engineering professor and director of the George Mason University Center for Regional Mobility, advised my staff that he provided the impetus for the new journal, which would be a transportation think tank. Dr. Palmer had served as administrator for the Research and Special Projects Administration and was, in fact, an appointee in President Carter's Transportation Department.

As is well known, the Urban Mass Transit Administration was interested in promoting light rail development. In 1988, there was no publication, as I am told, designed to review transportation policy issues focusing on the development of a light rail for urban and interurban mass transit. Dr. Palmer advised that he, in collaboration with the Free Congress Foundation, submitted an application to UMTA for a 4-year grant to assist with the startup of the journal.

The grant proposal, prepared by Dr. Palmer, spelled out that George Mason University faculty would provide technical input on substantive issues and articles for publication of the journal, as well as guidance on marketing, and the Free Congress Foundation was to be responsible for production, land, selling, print, and mailing. It was explained to me that the Free Congress Foundation was involved, because George Mason University does not have experience in magazine design and pro-

duction and needed a production partner for the venture.

I am further advised that there was review by the UMTA staff leading to the proposed grant being approved for 4 years, 1988 through 1992, with a grant totaling \$398,047, of which the Free Congress Foundation was to receive \$273,295, which is substantially less than the half million dollars alleged.

The funds received were to pay for the costs of producing the journal, and no one has suggested, to my knowledge, that the funds were in any way misused.

When the original grant expired, George Mason University applied for a 2-year extension, which was granted with an increase of \$128,000 of which the Free Congress Foundation was to receive \$111,000. Again, as I am advised, the Free Congress Foundation was made explicit in the renewal grant application. With a 2-year extension, the Free Congress Foundation will have received approximately \$384,000 for its efforts in producing the journal.

Madam President, I highlight the fact that the role of the Free Congress Foundation has been known since the initial application and certainly refutes any suggestion of laundering through the university.

The publication is a joint venture. This relationship has always been explicit. So I suggest that the use of the term "laundered" is really unfortunate. Nothing appears to be inappropriate in the way a professor of a public university sought a Federal grant to produce this journal.

Because the bylaws of the Free Congress Foundation prohibited them from accepting Government grants, the grant was made to George Mason University, but the role of Free Congress Foundation was explicit throughout the entire time.

The New Electric Railway Journal has proved to be successful.

While there are, according to Mr. William S. Lind, publisher of a journal and a former Senate staffer, about 14 other periodicals for the railway industry, the New Electric Railway Journal is the only one focusing on light rail and the only publication providing this kind of a voice as renewer or commentator on the trade. I am advised the other magazines are published by fans of railroads and trolley for transportation companies.

Beyond that, Madam President, the journal has been widely successful, according to Mr. Lind in the 2 years. When the 2-year extension was sought in 1992, the journal covered 90 percent of its costs and has sales approximating 8,000 copies per issue.

On its face, the journal is nonpolitical. It does not take either a liberal or conservative perspective.

Dr. Palmer of George Washington University was quoted in the Washington Post saying, "We look at the jour-

nal as being apolitical. It is hard to believe that a journal that talks about transit is somehow political."

In sum, Madam President, I would suggest that where a Presidential appointee with expertise in the field submits a grant application, as the foundation noted at the outset, it is entirely appropriate based on the facts provided to me. I would encourage my colleagues to examine the new Electric Railway Journal as I have. I submit it has met the requirements for the initial grant and renewal, and it has fully satisfied the terms of that grant and has met the goal set out.

I thank the Chair for the indulgence. I thank my colleague for allowing me this time and yield the floor.

RETIREMENT OF PATTI KUEBLER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Patti Kuebler of Waterloo, IA, for 10 successful years working with Operation Threshold.

Patti was in large part responsible for the development of such new programs as the Transitional Housing Program for Homeless Families, the Homeownership Program for Low-Income Families, Family Development Self-Sufficiency Program, Project S.U.C.C.E.S.S. with the Waterloo School System, and the Affordable Heating Assistance Program, just to name a few.

I would like to thank Patti for her outstanding commitment and leadership to both local and State councils, including the Black Hawk County Local Homeless Coordinating Board, the I-Care Advisory Council, Cedar Valley Food Bank Operations Committee, and the Cedar Valley United Way Planning and Allocation Committee.

Patti has given much to the people of Waterloo and the State of Iowa. It is because of exceptional people like Patti Kuebler that every tomorrow is a little bit brighter for the citizens of Iowa.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL F. SEMONIN, JR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to honor an outstanding Louisvillian who recently passed away. Paul F. Semonin, Jr., of Louisville, KY, was an outstanding citizen as well as a leader in his profession and community.

Madam President, Paul Semonin was indeed a success in business. He was president of the board of Paul Semonin Realtors, a real estate and development firm founded by his father in 1914. Paul Semonin, Jr. took over the company in 1941 and under his stewardship the company grew up to the largest most successful real estate firm in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

During his career he served as president of the Louisville Board of Realtors and the Kentucky Association of Realtors. Additionally, he was a vice president and director of the National Association of Realtors. In addition, Paul Semonin was responsible for the development of several residential and commercial properties, among these was Indian Hills, one of the most respected subdivisions in Louisville.

While we all admire a successful entrepreneur, I believe that Paul Semonin was even more prosperous as an individual. All who dealt with him came away knowing they had encountered a Kentucky gentleman in the truest sense of the word. In fact, while he was known as a shrewd businessman, he also carried with him a reputation as a kind, considerate, and caring human being.

Reputation was important to Paul Semonin, in fact he had a motto that guided the way he conducted himself in all aspects of his life. Madam President, I would like to share this motto now with my colleagues because I feel it is something we can all benefit from.

YOUR REPUTATION

A reputation for honesty and integrity, and one deserving of confidence, creates for you the image that best assures profits in this business.

With it, success will be yours and doors will swing wide to you.

Without it, your fate surely is one of mediocrity and failure.

Paul Semonin was a friend of mine, and Madam President, I can say with great certainty that he lived his life with that motto in mind. With it as his guide one can easily understand Paul Semonin's lifelong success. His commitment to integrity and honesty was unwavering and shone through in everything he was involved in.

Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Paul F. Semonin, Jr. Louisville will certainly miss his presence and devotion to excellence. The city can however take solace in the knowledge that Paul Semonin Realtors will carry on proudly in his legacy.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE BYRON WHITE

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I join with all Members of this Chamber in extending our best wishes to Supreme Court Justice Byron White, who announced today that he would retire from the Court this summer.

Justice White has given 31 years of his life to an extremely demanding job, and he is very deserving of a happy and healthy retirement.

Later this year, President Clinton will fulfill his constitutional duty of nominating a new Justice, and sending his name to the Senate for our advice and consent. His will be the first Democrat nomination to the Supreme Court in over a quarter of a century.

When I first came to the Senate, the Supreme Court nomination process was very civilized. What was once civilized, however, has now become politicized.

Throughout the Reagan and Bush administration, the Democrats have exhibited an unfortunate willingness to turn confirmation hearings into partisan inquisitions.

As we exhibited throughout the confirmation process of the Clinton Cabinet, it is the intention of Members of this side of the aisle to restore some dignity to the confirmation process.

During the campaign, candidate Clinton said that he would place a litmus test in his judicial nominations. It is my hope that President Clinton will not take this dangerous step, and will simply select the person—man or woman—who he believes is best qualified to serve on the Nation's Highest Court.

The President could do no better than nominating someone who had the same devotion to upholding—and not rewriting—the Constitution. And the same commitment to safeguarding America from crime as did Justice Byron White.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE'S TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, the Federal debt—run up by the U.S. Congress—stood at \$4,214,956,287,399.95 as of the close of business on Wednesday, March 17.

Anybody remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution is bound to know that no President can spend a dime of the taxpayers' money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. Therefore, no Member of Congress, House or Senate, can pass the buck as to the responsibility for this long-term and shameful display of irresponsibility. The dead cat lies on the doorstep of the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers \$286,022,000,000 merely to pay the interest on reckless Federal spending, approved by Congress—spending of the taxpayers' money over and above what the Federal Government has collected in taxes and other income. This has been what is called deficit spending—but it's really a form of thievery. Averaged out, this astounding interest paid on the Federal debt amounts to \$5.5 billion every week, or \$785 million every day—just to pay, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, the interest on the existing Federal debt.

Looking at it on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$16,409.61—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. The interest payments on this massive debt average out to be \$1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America. Or, looking at it still

another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone, mind you—comes to \$4,511.40 per year.

Does this prompt you to wonder what America's economic stability would be like today if, for the past five or six decades, there had been a Congress with the courage and the integrity to maintain a balanced Federal budget? The arithmetic speaks for itself.

BROAD-BASED COALITION OF FARM, OIL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL INTERESTS EMERGING IN SUPPORT OF ETBE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, yesterday the Senate had what I thought was a very enlightening debate about where ethanol should fit among our national priorities. That debate emphasized the ways in which a viable domestic ethanol industry can contribute to important environmental, energy, agricultural and budget policy goals. The question facing policymakers is how best to promote development of that industry.

The broad challenge facing ethanol proponents is how to expand the market for ethanol and make its cost competitive with other fuels. This challenge will be affected by policymakers' responses to three important questions.

First, how will ethanol be treated by the President's Btu tax?

Second, will ethanol be allowed to play a role in the Clean Air Act reformulated gasoline program [RFG] in ozone nonattainment areas?

And third, what potential does the commercialization of ethyl tertiary butyl ether, or ETBE, hold for future ethanol production?

We discussed the Btu tax question on this floor yesterday, and I will not belabor it further today. A proposed RFG rule, which is extremely important to the development of the domestic ethanol industry, particularly in the short-term, was promulgated by the Bush administration last October and published for public comment last month by EPA. I support that rule and believe strongly that finding a way for ethanol to play a role in improving air quality in ozone nonattainment areas, as was the intent of Congress, is both essential and doable. I look forward to working with Clinton administration officials toward that end.

Today, however, I want to take a minute to comment on the tremendous promise of ETBE and call my colleagues' attention to legislation that could help move this promising, environmentally benign renewable fuel to commercialization.

Madam President, I have been a strong supporter of the entire spectrum of renewable fuels. It is only natural, however, given the State I represent, that much of my interest has been directed toward the enhanced commercialization of agriculturally derived fuels, such as ethanol.

I am proud to say that, since my first involvement in this issue as a freshman Congressman 14 years ago, the fuel ethanol industry has made impressive strides on a number of fronts. Particularly noteworthy has been the commercial development of new technologies, spanning the spectrum from substantial reductions in the amount of energy required to manufacture a gallon of ethanol, to new methods of utilizing ethanol in gasoline as a means of improving motor vehicle performance and reducing fuel-related emissions.

One of the most dramatic recent examples has been the commercialization of ETBE, an ether produced by chemically combining ethanol with isobutylene, which refiners have found advantageous in making cleaner burning, reformulated gasoline with lower volatility and toxics. Over the past several years, ETBE has emerged in the eyes of petroleum refiners, automobile manufacturers and air quality experts as one of the oxygenates likely to be in widespread use over the next few years.

And what does this mean for the domestic ethanol industry? It means a tremendous new market opportunity that has attracted the support of the agricultural community, oil companies and environmentalists, three important interests that have not often seen eye-to-eye on energy policy.

Last month, an unprecedented coalition emerged to sign a letter to Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen requesting his support for "a legislative initiative to promote greater use of ethanol derived ethers such as ethyl tertiary butyl ether, better known as ETBE, in the manufacture of reformulated gasolines." The letter specifically proposes "to broaden the existing blenders income tax credit for ethanol used in the manufacture of ethers for gasoline blending."

In advocating the establishment of specific tax incentives for the commercialization of ETBE, the letter further states that, "by creating new market opportunities for domestically produced ethanol derived ethers, economic growth and investment opportunities can be developed across the country. It is a policy that makes sense for America and a sustainable energy future."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the ETBE letter to Secretary Bentsen and two fact sheets on ethanol-based ethers be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

And just what groups cosigned this precedent-setting letter to Secretary Bentsen? The names are significant: Amoco Oil; ARCO Chemical; Ashland Oil; the Clean Fuels Development Coalition, the National Corn Growers Association, the Oxygenated Fuels Association, Pekin Energy, the Renewable Fuels Association, and Texaco, Inc.

And what exactly is at stake in this effort to promote the commercialization of ETBE? Consider the potential contribution of this renewably derived fuel.

One hundred twenty billion gallons of gasoline are sold in the United States each year, and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 have set the stage for a major transformation of this huge market. By mandating the use of certain nonpetroleum based additives, commonly known as oxygenates, on a large scale beginning in 1995, this statute, through its reformulated gasoline [RFG] provision, has created a huge potential market that could be met in large measure by the establishment of environmentally clean, alternative liquid fuels facilities around the country.

Proper implementation of the RFG program over time could help reduce the Nation's trade deficit by displacing imported oil, stimulate the creation of stable, skilled jobs, improve air quality, and provide alternative value-added outlets for producers of natural gas, grain and even coal. All regions of the country could benefit, and the Nation's energy security could, for the first time in recent memory, see real improvement.

Put in perspective, technology advances that enable the cost-effective conversion of renewable alcohols to fungible, clean-burning, low volatility gasoline additives like ETBE, TAEE and similar compounds address nearly all of the policy objectives that have been set by the Clinton administration for putting the American economy back on track. The benefits affect a myriad of critical national priorities: environmental quality; job creation; consumer savings; and agricultural and energy security.

Madam President, I am hopeful that 1993 will be the year when national energy and environmental policy recognizes the full potential of renewable fuels for meeting these critical national policy goals. All renewable fuels should be exempt from the President's Btu tax. RFG rules should acknowledge a scientifically supportable role for ethanol in ozone non-attainment areas. And Congress should enact legislation that promotes the commercial viability of ETBE.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1993.

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN,
Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The organizations listed below respectfully request your support for a legislative initiative to promote greater use of ethanol derived ethers such as ethyl tertiary butyl ether, better known as ETBE, in the manufacture of reformulated gasolines. Specifically, we propose to broaden the existing blenders income tax credit for ethanol used in the manufacture of ethers for gasoline blending.

We believe that expansion of this credit as outlined below would provide the following advantages:

Support American agriculture by creating additional opportunities for ethanol in the form of ETBE to be used in gasolines.

Provide U.S. refiners with more flexibility in making reformulated gasolines as required under the Clean Air Act.

Promote energy security by reducing dependence on both imported crude oil and imported gasoline blending components.

Promote job opportunities by encouraging expansion of domestic ether and ethanol production capacity.

To carry out these goals, we propose the following three changes to the existing tax credit for ethanol used to manufacture ETBE:

1. Make the tax credit available to a broader range of taxpayers by making it equally creditable against the Alternative Minimum Tax as well as regular income tax.

2. Remove the tax credit from taxable income, consistent with other tax credits.

3. To facilitate IRS enforcement, make the tax credit applicable to the ETBE at the point of manufacture, rather than at the blender location.

By creating new market opportunities for domestically-produced ethanol derived ethers, economic growth and investment opportunities can be developed across the country. It is a policy that makes sense for America and a sustainable energy future.

Should you have any questions, please contact either James Pruitt (Texaco: 202-331-1427), Eric Vaughn (Renewable Fuels Association: 202-289-3835), or Doug Durante (Clean Fuels Development Coalition: 301-913-9636). At your convenience, representatives of our organizations would be happy to meet with you or your staff to review our proposal in greater detail. We would appreciate any support your office could provide in advancing our initiative.

Respectfully,

Amoco, ARCO Chemical Company, Ashland Oil Company, Clean Fuels Development Coalition, National Corn Growers Association, Oxygenated Fuels Association, Pekin Energy, Renewable Fuels Association, Texaco Inc.

ETHANOL-BASED ETHERS—ETBE AND TAAE

Clean Air Act requirements to make cleaner burning, reformulated gasoline (RFG) with lower volatility and toxics has created new interest in ethanol-based ethers such as ETBE (ethyl tertiary butyl ether) and TAAE (tertiary amyl ethyl ether).

Energy/Environmental Policy Benefits.—Relative to other oxygenates, ethanol-based ethers provide refiners with more flexibility and economic advantages in making RFG.

Unlike other oxygenates, ETBE lowers gasoline volatility:

ETBE provides more octane and will enable refiners to maintain product quality;

ETBE enhances energy security by displacing more gasoline produced from imported crude, and reduces our dependence on imported methanol and MTBE sources for RFG production. This decreases our trade imbalance and puts more biomass energy into our transportation energy pool;

Because ethanol in the form of ETBE can be pipeline shipped, it will be able to penetrate markets that the current gasoline supply infrastructure makes difficult.

These combined benefits reduce refinery investments and decrease the cost of making low volatility and reformulated gasolines.

Farm/Rural Development Policy Benefits.—ETBE is made with domestic ether ca-

pacity and would draw on mostly domestic, non-petroleum energy sources for raw materials.

ETBE Helps American Agriculture: Millions of bushels of corn could be used in the production of ethanol for ether manufacture, increasing rural income and decreasing farm program costs.

ETBE Creates Jobs: Expands domestic ether capacity and ethanol production which creates jobs across the country in farming, plant operation, and transportation and domestic energy development.

Removing Barriers to ETBE Commercialization.—With imports suppressing methanol market prices below full production costs and foreign MTBE capacity being developed with subsidized raw materials, full development of U.S. ETBE production is currently unattainable. Improvements in the alcohol tax credit's effectiveness are necessary for commercialization to continue.

Broad Support.—A cross section of oil refiners, ethanol producers, farmers, and consumers support changes to the alcohol tax credit which will make ethanol based ethers competitive with other oxygenates.

Regulations proposed by the EPA to implement the reformulated gasoline requirements of the Clean Air Act will require significant capital investment by refiners. According to the proposed rule, refiners will be required to reduce the amount of aromatics currently used for octane to no more than 25 percent; reduce mass-based VOC emissions by dramatically reducing gasoline volatility; and, add to least 2.0 percent oxygen in gasoline to further reduce exhaust emissions.

Several oxygenates will compete for this new market, including the methanol-based ethers—MTBE and TAME. But the stringent requirements for refiners to reduce the volatility of gasoline has created new interest in ethanol-based ethers as well. While not used today, both ETBE (ethyl tertiary butyl ether) and TAAE (tertiary amyl ethyl ether) will actually reduce the volatility of gasoline when blended, and as a result could provide refiners with significant flexibility and economic advantages in the production of low volatility gasolines when compared to the methanol-based options.

ETBE can reduce the cost of producing reformulated gasoline: ETBE is another that is produced by chemically combining ethanol with isobutylene. Most isobutylene for others is derived from butanes, a product in natural gas liquids. Each gallon of ETBE contains about 0.42 gallons of ethanol. The production of TAAE is similar to ETBE except that the ethanol is chemically combined with isoamylene, a volatile and atmospherically reactive hydrocarbon that is currently blended into gasoline.

COMPARISON OF BUTYL ETHERS AT 2.0 PERCENT OXYGEN IN RFG

	MTBE	ETBE
RVP	+0.02	-0.48
Octane	+2.4	+3.1
Volume (percent)	11.0	12.8

As noted by the above table, ETBE actually lowers gasoline volatility (RVP) when blended in gasoline, even in low RVP, summer grade RFG. When blended for oxygen, it also provides 25% more octane. With this added flexibility, refiners may significantly reduce the capital investment necessary to meet RFG volatility and aromatic requirements. As an example, refiners must decrease their summer grade of gasoline in the south from 7.8 psi to 7.2 psi. ETBE will provide 0.5 psi of that 0.6 psi reduction when blended for oxygen in RFG.

In addition, the higher volume of ETBE necessary to meet the oxygen content specification for RFG will result in a greater displacement of other gasoline compounds such as benzene, sulphur, olefins and high boiling compounds currently in gasoline. The combination of greater displacement and higher octane will assist the refiners in reducing aromatics such as benzene, toluene and xylene, thereby assisting refiners in meeting the required 15% reduction in toxics. This will enable refiners to produce RFG without sacrificing gasoline performance or quality.

Finally, it is important to note numerous studies by industry, EPA and other institutions conclude that ETBE compares quite favorably to MTBE on both emissions and performance.

ETBE Economics: Given the superior blending, performance and emissions characteristics of ETBE, a refiner's decision to use ethanol as a feedstock for ethers, as opposed to methanol, would appear to be both obvious and simple. Unfortunately, the economic advantage for methanol, which has been imported from foreign energy sources for as low as 25 cents per gallon, makes the manufacturers of ETBE produced from American grain-derived ethanol uneconomic, and a change to the existing ETBE credit is necessary for commercialization to continue.

Proposed changes to the ETBE Credit: In 1990, the Internal Revenue Service clarified that ethanol used in the production of ETBE or similar ethers qualified for the 54 cent-per-gallon alcohol blenders credit under Section 40 of the Code. However, the structure of the credit lends itself to a number of limitations. For one, the value or use of this credit is dependent upon a refiner's tax status which fluctuates from year to year. A company will not be able to take advantage of the ETBE credit anytime it falls into Alternative Minimum Tax or is not producing any taxable income. Another problem is that the credit is currently claimed by the gasoline marketer rather than the ether producer. ETBE will be distributed in gasoline blends by a number of refiners at many different marketing locations. Thus, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the ETBE producer to capture the value of the credit from the market place. It also creates accountability problems for IRS in trying to monitor and enforce the qualifying volume of ethanol at all the possible gasoline marketing locations. Lastly, the value of the tax credit is mitigated by its designation as taxable income. As a result of these limitations, the availability of the credit has not stimulated the expected commercialization of ETBE.

To make the section 40 credit workable and allow ethanol based ethers to be competitive with other oxygenates for ether manufacture, three amendments to the Internal Revenue Code are necessary:

(1) *Make the credit available to a broader range of potential customers.*—The credit should not be subject to a taxpayer's tax status. The credit should be equally creditable against the Alternative Minimum Tax as well as regular income tax.

(2) *Make the credit competitive.*—To make ethanol based ethers competitive with other oxygenates, the credit must be removed from taxable income, consistent with other tax credits.

(3) *Improve IRS enforcement.*—The credit should be applied to the smaller number of ETBE manufacturers, rather than to the hundreds of potential ETBE blenders in the market place.

Public Policy Benefits of a More Workable ETBE Credit: By creating new market oppor-

tunities for domestically-produced ethanol, tremendous economic growth and investment opportunities will develop across the country.

ETBE Helps American Agriculture: While methanol can be produced from domestic natural gas (itself an important alternative fuel), future methanol demand will most likely be satisfied by expending foreign capacity with low cost natural gas. However, ethanol for ETBE is produced from American grain, increasing rural income and decreasing farm program costs.

ETBE Creates Jobs: If most of the growth in new ether demand created with the U.S. Clean Air Act is satisfied by new foreign MTBE capacity, it will only result in a net reduction of U.S. jobs to accommodate the imported oxygenate. However, ETBE will only be produced domestically using U.S. ethanol production which is labor intensive and creates many thousands of jobs across the country in farming, plant operation, and transportation.

ETBE Enhances Energy Security: Relative to other oxygenates, ethanol-derived ethers such as ETBE displaces even more gasoline produced from imported crude. Since ETBE will almost exclusively be made from U.S. raw materials, development of this ether will reduce dependency on imported methanol or MTBE as well as imported crude for gasoline. Therefore, ETBE produced from ethanol will reduce our trade imbalance and increase U.S. energy security.

ETBE Enhances Refining/Marketing Operations: Ethanol in the form of ETBE can be pipeline shipped. Therefore, it will be able to penetrate markets that the current gasoline supply infrastructure makes difficult.

It is important to note that changing the ETBE credit to allow ethanol to compete effectively with methanol for ether production is supported by a broad cross section of oil refiners, ethanol producers, farmers, and consumers. It is a policy which makes sense for America and a sustainable energy future.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN ASIA— INTERESTS AND POLICIES

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a very important report on America's role in Asia. Indeed, the title of the report, "America's Role in Asia—Interests and Policies," signifies both the promise of the future of America's relations with Asia and the necessity of devising effective policies which will achieve that promise. No longer can we afford to mouth the platitudes, to give voice to the cant of diplomacy; we must engage, we must perform, we must defend America's interests with policies grounded in a learned understanding of the new Asia and America's role in that vital region of the world.

I am grateful, Madam President, to the distinguished scholars and policy experts from both in and out of government who contributed of their time and intellect and energy to inform the report prepared by the Center for Asian Pacific Affairs of the Asia Foundation. This report argues that Asia rivals Europe in importance to the United States. It also makes clear that the region has never received sustained, high-level attention from either the

Congress or the executive branch. Regrettably, the report notes that U.S. prestige and influence have declined in Asia. Fortunately, the report recommends steps to be taken to reverse this decline.

Madam President, I do not intend to discuss the report at length today; it should be read. It is well written and informative. I do not pretend to improve on it in these remarks. But, I believe it should be read—no, studied—by my colleagues. I am not unaware of the fact that we must concern ourselves with domestic affairs, but I am also not ignorant of the fact that foreign affairs have a tremendous impact on our ability to provide safety, security, and economic welfare for our people. If Members of the Senate learn nothing more from this report than the fact that America now sells more to Japan than it does to Germany, Italy, and France combined, it will be worth the reading. If they also learn that, despite the volume of American sales, Japan amassed a surplus of \$100 billion in its trade with the United States last year, the report may—I say may—awaken us to the need to devise policies to protect and enlarge United States interests in Asia.

Madam President, to avoid excessive costs, I will not ask that the full text of the report be printed in the RECORD. I would, however, ask that the foreword, preface, and part I—the crux of the report—be printed in the RECORD. The full report can be obtained from the Asia Foundation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

In September 1991, The Asia Foundation's Center for Asian Pacific Affairs (CAPA) convened a planning conference to develop a project on America's role in Asia following the end of the Cold War. In January 1992 William Fuller, the president of The Asia Foundation, and CAPA's executive director, Casimir Yost, asked the two of us to chair a working group to:

Examine the political, economic, and security changes occurring in Asia;

Explore the implications of these changes for American interests and policies; and

Produce a report making recommendations with respect to U.S. policies and priorities in the Asia-Pacific region, including Northeast, Southeast, and South Asia.

The working group, which met four times between May and October 1992, was composed of American policy experts from in and out of government. Lt. General (ret.) William Odom chaired a separate study group focusing on security challenges facing the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. General Odom's group met twice, and his group's findings were reported to our group. In addition, a preliminary draft of the final report was reviewed by the CAPA Advisory Council chaired by Douglas Bennet, President of National Public Radio.

This report on "America's Role in Asia—Interests and Policies" reflects the discussions of these seven meetings. Roughly 70 people, representing a spectrum of opinion and expertise, were involved in one or more

of these meetings. William Barnds, who has worked in both the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. Government, and Casimir Yost, executive director of CAPA, were primary drafters of the report. Members of the working group were not asked to agree formally to the final statement. For government officials who participated in our deliberations, this would have been particularly inappropriate. All members of the working group joined in their individual capacities; none spoke on behalf of any agency or institution.

This report provides a framework for considering America's role in Asia. It is divided into two parts. Part I summarizes major findings arising from our deliberations, identifies immediate issues requiring decisions, and outlines longer-term priorities for U.S. policies in the Asia-Pacific region. Part II analyzes these longer-term priorities and offers specific recommendations for pursuing them.

We commend this report to policymakers and analysts, and we support its recommendations. We believe, and the report argues, that the primary and immediate challenges facing our country are at home. However, we firmly believe that in an interdependent world our domestic problems can best be addressed in a stable, international environment characterized by expanding economic well-being and an increasing commitment to democratic values. The United States must continue to play a significant role in global affairs to ensure these positive developments. This report seeks to illuminate the issues and provide direction as policymakers proceed to form policies toward a region vital to America.

We are grateful to The Brayton Wilbur Foundation and The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc., for assisting in the underwriting of the deliberations of the working group and to The Asia Foundation's Center for Asian Pacific Affairs for sponsoring this effort. This report, of course, should not be taken as an expression of Foundation views, but its production is very much in keeping with the Center's efforts to convene bipartisan groups to examine the difficult challenges facing the nations and peoples of the Asia-Pacific region. It is intended that future CAPA-sponsored working groups will examine in greater depth issues identified in this report as being critical to "America's Role in Asia."

ROBERT SCALAPINO,

Co-Chair, America's Role Working Group,
Robson Research Professor of Government
Emeritus, University of California at
Berkeley.

LEWIS COLEMAN,

Co-Chair, America's Role Working Group,
Vice Chairman of the Board,
BankAmerica Corporation.

PREFACE: SEIZE THE MOMENT

Despite domestic challenges confronting it today, the United States is the strongest nation in the world—economically, politically, and militarily America's strength, however, is increasingly dependent upon the vitality and stability of other key global regions. No nation, even the strongest, can stand aloof and alone in these times.

Of the key global regions, none may be more crucial to U.S. interests than the Asia-Pacific region. Indeed, we are already a part of its region, with the western United States extending into the mid-Pacific. Asia is our economic lifeline, the locale of nations that will play key roles in the 21st century and a primary testing ground for settling regional disputes.

On balance, there is reason for optimism regarding the future of Asia. Economically it continues as one of the fastest developing regions in the world. Politically, the basic trend is toward greater openness, even within most authoritarian states. And with ideology having declined in importance, political differences are a reduced obstacle to economic and cultural interaction. The risks of a major power conflict in this region are fewer than they have been at any time in the 20th century. Today, most nations, whatever their political system, are concentrating on domestic concerns.

There is no absence of problems, to be sure. Two divided nations continue to exist in Asia, having made progress in their mutual relationships, but with no final resolution in sight. Moreover, a variety of other territorial issues exists, some between major countries. In southern Asia, ethnic, religious, and regional differences provide additional complexities. Despite the end of the Cold War, military budgets of many Asian nations continue to rise. Nor can nuclear proliferation be ignored.

Beyond this, rapid economic development creates its own problems. Class and regional differences grow. Urbanization brings new challenges, as does the breakdown of traditional values. Asia is spearheading this age of global revolution, taking the risks implicit in progress.

Understandably, the question of how to balance stability and development is everywhere a central concern.

In this setting, the continuing presence of the United States is crucial, to Asia and to us. Virtually every Asian nation wants the United States to remain a major actor in the region, recognizing the need for a balancing force, a cushion between states still burdened with hostile legacies. Further, they see the United States as a source of advanced technology and training for the coming Asian generations, and an important market for Asian exports; a political system that, whatever its shortcomings, has inspired many as the best means of liberating the human spirit, and a culture that partakes of every variation, classical and modern.

The task for the United States is first to realize that in this revolutionary age, there can be no final answers, no permanent institutions. Accepting complexity and experimentation are essential. We must operate at unilateral, bilateral, regional, and global levels simultaneously, the mix altered as each situation demands. The supreme challenge for America's leaders is to explain complex issues and incremental approaches so Americans accept constructive long-term engagement rather than demand short-term solutions.

It is also important that the broad movement be from unilateralism to multilateralism—both in decision-making and the execution of policies. Americans rightfully demand greater burden-sharing in international affairs from other nations; we must also accept greater decision-sharing.

In the years ahead, the allocation of authority among subnational, national, and international institutions will be crucially important to peace and development in Asia as elsewhere. This issue will never be finally resolved, with constant re-examination as required, as the United States herself has so graphically illustrated. Nationalism is and will continue to be a powerful force, but many concerns of great import to citizens of modern states are local in nature. At the same time, economic tides drive us toward new regional and global experiments, and the

revolution in communications makes isolation increasingly passé, even for the most remote nations. For these reasons, we—and others—must operate at many levels simultaneously.

Of paramount importance is getting our own house in order. But attention paid exclusively to domestic issues would be self-defeating and, indeed, impossible, given the nature of the contemporary world. This is the 1990s, not the 1930s. In addition to supporting current regional and global efforts, we must bargain rigorously to obtain fair trade and investment practices. The American people will accept no less, nor should they. But in the economic realm, as in other realms, we must build coalitions opposing exclusiveness, national or regional, and continue to support the principle of a free and open marketplace—of goods and ideas. The latter goal is built into American culture.

At the same time, it is imperative that here, too, we build coalitions. Democracy and human rights values must be internationalized to be advanced effectively. Within these values, moreover, there is room for variation, depending upon the given culture and stage of development of a nation. The world never has been and will never be cast in a single mold.

In dealing with authoritarian states, it is wise to remember that even in the most rigid, elements of pluralism are present, a product of the extraordinary developments of recent years. Leninism is fighting a rear-guard action. It is the mark of a sophisticated policy that plays to such pluralist elements, noting that international involvement abets greater diversity and openness in authoritarian states. Isolation buttresses extremism.

Finally, this is the age when the term, "comprehensive security," has become almost universally accepted, with economic and social quotients recognized as growing in importance. It is proper that our military budget be reduced and our military strategy be reconsidered, with an increasing emphasis upon rapid deployment and mobile forces. It is also proper that nations aligned with us accept greater responsibility for their own defense, especially in terms of ground forces.

But at this delicate juncture there is still no substitute in this vital region for American military credibility; nothing would be more destabilizing than a precipitous strategic withdrawal of the United States.

We are at a juncture of history when the opportunities for creative, new policies are unexcelled. The type of global conflict that devastated the world twice in this century is virtually impossible at present. Science and technology now offer new ways of solving or reducing age-old economic and social problems. And most leaders and people are in a flexible, experimental mood with respect to economic, social, and political issues and institutions. The window of opportunity that exists today may not always be present. No one can predict what the power configurations of the 21st century will be, especially if we have not created new policies and a new set of institutions, regional and global.

PART I. CHANGE IN ASIA

An Overview

This is a time of enormous fluidity in Asia. The receding Russian presence has stimulated improved relations between a number of states in the region. Rapid economic growth has created prosperity in many countries of the region and has fostered an expanding middle class. Intraregional trade is more than 40 percent of all Asian trade—up from 30 percent in 1986. And widening par-

ticipation in governance is occurring in many countries in the region.

A central question now is how Asia will organize itself. Regional stability could be undermined by leadership succession struggles in Vietnam, China, North Korea, and Indonesia. The unresolved issue of Korean unification is particularly troubling because of the pivotal geographic position of the two Koreas between Japan and China. Government institutions in much of the region are weak; there are no region-wide multilateral institutions. Historical animosities and undefined roles for regional players foster uncertainty. Official economic cooperation in Asia has only recently begun to develop, with the formation of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), a regional forum.

The United States and Asia

In recent years, American policy-makers in the Executive Branch and Congress have focused much of their attention on the enormous challenges and opportunities created by the political upheavals in the former Soviet Union and Central Europe. No one can question the importance of the breakup of the Soviet empire and of the unification of Germany.

However, there has been a deterioration in our ties with key Asian states. In some cases we were not at fault. Pakistan seems determined to proceed with its nuclear program. The Philippine Senate refused renewal of our base agreements. China's treatment of its citizens strained Beijing's relations with many capitals beyond Washington.

However, Asia has not received sustained, high-level attention in the U.S. Executive Branch and Congress in recent years. Few members of Congress are knowledgeable about Asia, and senior cabinet officers have given only sporadic attention to the region. Individual issues have excited interest, but there has not been broad U.S. engagement with the region and its leaders. Further, U.S. Government economic policies toward the region have been poorly coordinated.

Regrettably, U.S. prestige and influence are declining in Asia. In part, this is simply a reflection of the rising influence of other players in the region, including Japan and China. However, other factors are also important: Asian leaders are disturbed at our inability to take the hard decisions to restore the health of our domestic economy. They worry that their access to the huge American market will be significantly restricted. Second, many Asian leaders do not believe the United States will remain committed to maintaining its security commitments in Asia. They worry about the deterioration of our relations with both China and Japan. Many Asian leaders want the U.S. militarily and economically engaged in the region, not the least as a hedge against expanding Chinese or Japanese power.

At the same time, some Americans fear the rising competitiveness of Asian economies and they question the justification for maintaining U.S. forces in Asia.

A fundamental rupture of trans-Pacific links is unlikely in the short run. Our residual strength in Asia is enormous. Our markets, our military presence in the region, our technology, and our higher-education system are all important components of American influence.

But we are witnessing the gradual weakening of political ties between this country and the region while private, commercial, and financial links are growing. Loss of U.S. political influence in Asia means more decisions will be made in Asian capitals without reference to U.S. wishes or interests. Reversing

this trend requires greater American attention to the region and new, more constructive U.S. policies.

Challenges and Opportunities in the Asia-Pacific Region

Asia rivals Europe in importance to the United States and presents us with a complex security environment. Six of the world's nine largest armies are Asian, and the military budgets of many Asian nations are rising. Antinomies among and within a number of Asian countries are high. While the direct threat to the United States has declined, risk of conflict disrupting regional stability remains substantial on the Korean Peninsula, around the borders of China, and between India and Pakistan. Through its military presence in Asia and treaty relationships, the United States supports regional stability. Our presence has facilitated the Asian economic boom. Our precipitous withdrawal could have dangerous adverse consequences for regional stability and economic prosperity.

The new or emerging leaders of Asia are, by and large, pragmatists less committed to ideology than their predecessors and determined to capture the economic potential of the region. They see prosperity coming through cooperation, not confrontation.

This is a region where there is growing acceptance of market economies, and there are enormous opportunities for positive engagement between Asian nations and the United States, already an active participant in Asia's economic growth.

In 1980 U.S. trans-Pacific trade roughly equaled our trade with Western Europe. By 1991 U.S. trade across the Pacific was over 40 percent greater than our trade with Western Europe, totaling more than \$315 billion. We sell more to Japan than to Germany, Italy, and France combined. In 1991 we sold more to Indonesia alone than to all of Central and Eastern Europe. Asian growth rates insure growing markets for a wide range of U.S. goods and services. Asian infrastructure projects offer huge opportunities for U.S. firms. Roughly two million American jobs can be related to U.S. merchandise exports of \$118 billion to the Asia-Pacific region in 1991. Exports of American services to the region are, of course, responsible for many tens of thousands of additional jobs.

Finally, Asian nations are struggling with many of the same issues that concern us: environment, health, the role of women in society, and governance. We can and should learn from each other.

Meeting Challenges and Seizing Opportunities in Asia

The Clinton administration and the Congress face significant challenges at home and abroad. The president was elected with a mandate for domestic renewal and change, but must be alert to global risks and opportunities. Foreign crises can interfere with domestic renewal, while active participation in the global economy can help the United States restore its domestic economic health.

It is essential that the administration continually solicit and listen to Asian views. For too long, Asia has been treated as relatively unimportant. Further, we should not let single issues dominate our relations with individual nations. This does not mean that the United States should ignore its critical interests or deeply held views. It does mean that we must take into account the multiplicity of our interests in the region and with individual countries.

We must develop a policy of active engagement with the Asia-Pacific region. The Clinton

administration faces immediate issues in Asia, coupled with the necessity to craft a long-term approach to the region. Some questions cannot be avoided; others can be avoided only at great risk. The consequences of bad decisions can endure for a long time. It is precisely because our major focus must be on domestic priorities that foreign policy questions must be handled with extraordinary care.

Few issues can be handled unilaterally by the United States. Some can be managed bilaterally, but increasingly we and our Asian partners must work cooperatively through regional and multilateral organizations and coalitions to meet security, economic, environmental, and other challenges. Successful diplomacy in the 1990s and beyond will increasingly entail our operating on multiple levels.

The Immediate Agenda

What follows is a checklist of issues relating to our Asia-Pacific interests that need prompt attention. Most of the issues requiring immediate attention cannot be solved quickly. What is needed are solid beginnings to good, longer-term policies.

The United States must expand its exports abroad as part of a broad-based effort to improve America's domestic economic performance. Prompt conclusion of the Uruguay Round of trade talks, on terms acceptable to the United States, will facilitate this expansion in Asia and around the world. Insuring that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) does not exclude imports from the other regions will help open and expand markets in Asia. Improving the ability of the various U.S. Government agencies to coordinate global economic policy will help lay the groundwork for success.

Many Asians are apprehensive about the durability of U.S. security commitments, including maintaining a substantial military presence in the region. It is essential that these commitments be reaffirmed promptly. Doing so would not be inconsistent with a subsequent review, carried out with our Asian partners, of how these commitments might best be pursued in the future.

The centrality of the U.S.-Japan alliance should be reaffirmed, while setting in place a process for reviewing and coordinating U.S. policies toward this critical Asian partner.

U.S. relations with China may face an early test. It is vital that the Clinton administration prepare for comprehensive dialogue with China on issues ranging from human rights, to trade, arms transfers, and regional security. It would be unwise to take immediate action on any one aspect of the bilateral relationship pending a full review of our overall relationship with the Peoples Republic of China (PRC).

The administration should focus immediate attention on the broad issue of weapons of mass destruction in the Asia-Pacific region. While solutions will not come easily, this problem is worsening and could affect the peace and stability of the region, from South to Northeast Asia.

Subject to continued progress on the Prisoner-of-War/Missing-in-Action (POW/MIA) issue, progressive normalization of relations with Vietnam should continue, leading to a lifting of the U.S. embargo and diplomatic relations.

The future stability of Cambodia is in serious doubt. The United Nations' presence there must receive our continuing support to reduce further disruptions by the Khmer Rouge. This crisis is an important test case of the world community's ability to fashion and sustain multilateral responses to security challenges in the post-Cold War era.

The Long-Term Agenda

Nothing will be simple for the United States in the Asia-Pacific region.

Asia's continuing remarkable economic progress offers a huge and expanding market for U.S. goods and services, but Asian penetration of the U.S. market remains a significant challenge. Our security problems in the region are, at once, easier and more complex. Easier because Soviet power is no more. Russia is unlikely to exert serious influence in Asia for some time to come. More complex because the remaining threats are more localized and the contribution to regional stability of the American military presence in the region more difficult to explain. Finally, while progress has occurred in Asia in the direction of opening political processes, authoritarian and Leninist states remain. Asia is not destined to have a single political order.

Our relations in the region, including every bilateral relationship, will be characterized by elements of cooperation and competition. Other countries will demand to be part of decisions, particularly where their interests are directly affected. Consultation will be more important in the future. We will have to be mindful about the limits of our influence. We cannot expect to be both less present in the region and more influential. We must guard against actions taken to satisfy narrow constituencies in this country, that do not further broad U.S. interests in the region.

Increasingly, we must seek multilateral approaches to the security, economic, political and environmental challenges in Asia. The era of America dictating to individual countries is largely over, except where our most vital interests are directly involved. We should look on this emerging reality as providing the opportunity for unprecedented trans-Pacific cooperation.

The central task of the Clinton administration is to craft and implement a strategy toward the Asia-Pacific region that accommodates this complexity while furthering U.S. participation in Asian economic growth, maintenance of peace and stability in the region, and the peaceful evolution of authoritarian regimes toward more open political systems. In these efforts, progress will not be linear. We should expect setbacks. We may face difficult choices between preserving particular American jobs and furthering a free-trade system and between arms exports and arms control.

It is essential for three reasons that the United States develop a comprehensive, coherent approach to Asia and that the president take pains to articulate that policy to the citizenry: (1) the American people will not support a policy they cannot understand, (2) an unsupported and incoherent policy will be attacked and undermined in Congress, and (3) continued cooperation between Asian states and the United States will depend on our credibility as an active player in the region.

Asia is important to the United States, but not all of the Asia-Pacific region is equally important to us. U.S. interests in their fullest dimensions—economic, security, political—come together in Northeast Asia. The focus of our interests in Southeast Asia will be primarily, but not exclusively, economic. Constructive American relations with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) will enhance stability in the region. In South Asia we have a special interest in insuring that the risks of nuclear and missile proliferation not become greater and that the terrible problems of hunger, disease, and population growth are addressed.

U.S. policies in the Asia-Pacific region should, therefore, focus on the following priorities which are identified in brief below and examined in detail in Part II of this report:

- Seizing economic opportunities,
- Safeguarding U.S. security and political interests,
- Sustaining and expanding freedom,
- Recasting the U.S.-Japan relationship,
- Setting Sino-American relations in a new context,
- Confronting environmental challenges.

Seizing Economic Opportunities in Asia

Special attention must be paid to the opportunities and challenges offered by the Asia-Pacific region, which holds the fastest growing economies in the world. Advancing American economic competitiveness is a challenge not only for U.S. firms and workers but also for the U.S. Government. Not only must conditions in our domestic economic environment encourage higher productivity, but the U.S. Government must continue its drive to open markets throughout the world and to harness a wide range of currently underfunded and often uncoordinated government programs to support most effectively the expansion of U.S. exports.

Safeguarding U.S. Security and Political Interests in Asia

It remains in our interest that no single foreign power dominate Asia. The threat of a direct attack on the United States has virtually disappeared. However, our military presence in the region contributes to stability by helping to prevent regional animosities from erupting. Regional peace could be disrupted on the Korean Peninsula, between China and one of its neighbors, or between India and Pakistan. Major conflict could place in jeopardy important U.S. economic interests in the region. It is critical, therefore, that for the foreseeable future the United States maintain a credible forward-based military presence in Asia. Alterations in the American military role in Asia are inevitable, but we must continue to work with others in the region to foster peaceful settlement of disputes. This requires our continued physical presence on the ground in Asia, even if at reduced levels.

Sustaining and Expanding Freedom in Asia

Economic growth and the attractiveness of democratic values and processes have spurred political liberalization in a number of Asian countries. The linkage between economic well-being and the prospects for greater political openness in Asia is clear. Pluralism is increasing in most, though not all, of the authoritarian regimes in Asia. This trend deserves our encouragement. We must support emerging democracies through both government and private initiatives. A premium, moreover, must be upon internationalizing such causes as support for human rights. In most cases, the cause of greater political openness is advanced by engaging rather than isolating. We should seek not to impose our institutions, but rather to encourage indigenous efforts at reform. We must make it clear, however, that the United States supports more open and democratic political systems.

Recasting the U.S.-Japan Relationship

The U.S.-Japan relationship is the central U.S. bilateral relationship in Asia. If it is positive, much else falls into place in the region. If it is adversarial, our interests throughout the region can be harmed. We must not let one issue so dominate the relationship that the whole relationship is ad-

versely affected. Greater partnership with Japan must be forged on a wide range of issues. This requires that we include Japan in the decision-making process. Japan, in turn, must play a more responsible role in global economic and political affairs. It is in the U.S. interest that we work on a common agenda with Japan seeking global economic growth, expanded assistance to developing countries, greater political openness, new approaches to regional tensions, and preservation of the environment. We should not seek a greatly expanded role for Japan in the security field. That would only exacerbate fears among Japan's neighbors. Japan's limited role should not, however, preclude its direct participation in United Nations operations, such as those currently underway in Cambodia. We should seek agreement with Japan on what constitutes equitable sharing of the burdens imposed on both our countries in playing leadership roles around the world.

Setting Sino-American Relations in a New Context

If Japan offers a good opportunity for constructive collaboration with the United States, China poses a risk of confrontation.

Our dilemmas with respect to China are real. We have a significant trade deficit with China and differences with respect to Chinese arms transfers and human rights policies. Fifteen nations border on China and many have important ongoing or potential differences with the Peoples Republic of China (PRC). On the other hand, China is capable of exerting positive influence over the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia and over North Korea. China's seat on the U.N. Security Council allows Beijing to block action as well as facilitate United Nations responses to crises. Very significant economic linkages have been formed among southern China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. In sum, China is and will continue to be a significant regional power and one capable of playing a global role in certain instances.

It is not in our interest that China be isolated. It is in our interest that China become more involved in the world community by facing the complexities that international participation inevitably brings. China remains a test case of the proposition that, in time, economic liberalization can lead to political liberalization. It is in America's interest that both occur and that our policies encourage both.

Confronting Environmental Challenges in Asia

It is inevitable that immediate issues will dominate the administration's agenda, but joining with our Asian partners in confronting the environmental challenges of the region must command administration and congressional attention. This cannot be a unilateral effort of the United States; only cooperative actions can succeed. Fresh approaches and, perhaps, new institutions must be considered.

We must reassert our support of family planning efforts in Asia. (More than half of all global population growth occurs in Asia with an annual increment in excess of 50 million people.)

Moreover, the U.S. Government should actively support the transfer of environmental technology and methods to Asian countries and peoples.

HELEN HAYES: IN MEMORIAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, the entire Nation and much of the world mourns the passing on Wednes-

day of Helen Hayes, but there is a special sadness here in Washington and in the capital city of my State of South Carolina.

Helen Hayes was a daughter of the District of Columbia—born, raised, and schooled here. She began her stage career at the age of 5 at the National Theater in 1906, and ended it here 66 years later in a performance at Catholic University's Hartke Theater. Less well known is the fact that Helen Hayes had a special relationship with the University of South Carolina in Columbia, where she received an honorary degree and devoted herself to improving the school's drama program.

Madam President, Helen Hayes will be long remembered as the grand lady of American theater in the 20th century. Those of us who were privileged to know her personally will also remember her as one of the grand human beings of the 20th century. Our grief at Helen Hayes' passing is tempered by our vivid memory of her rich and passionate life.

ROBERT KENNEDY REMEMBERED BY MARK SHIELDS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, Mark Shields is a columnist for the Washington Post and a popular television pundit. A quarter century ago, he was our colleague here on Capitol Hill as an adviser to then-Senator Robert Kennedy of New York. Bobby and I were both freshman Senators together, and I have tremendously fond memories of our times together.

Those memories were brought back to me as I read Mark Shields' superb memoir of Bobby Kennedy's 1968 campaign in Monday's Post. Shields vividly recalls Bobby's remarkable blend of toughness and compassion, and how those qualities allowed him to unite urban blacks and northern working-class whites behind his candidacy.

Madam President, the Shields column titled "Twenty-Five St. Patrick's Days Ago * *": Robert Kennedy Was a Different Kind of Candidate," will strike a chord in all of us who have devoted our lives to politics. I commend it to my colleagues, and to that end I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was not like most presidential campaigns where the terminally careful candidate strives not to make waves, mistakes or powerful enemies. It was a different campaign, one where the presidential candidate would regularly and harshly scold his audiences for their selfishness. For the candidate, it was not enough merely to comfort the afflicted who loved him; he deliberately chose to afflict the comfortable as well.

Twenty-five St. Patrick's Days ago, after hesitating probably too long, Robert Kennedy began his run for president. Since 1968, an awful lot has changed in our country and

in our world. But the legacy of Robert Kennedy is timeless: That rare candidate who has the guts to tell an audience both what the candidate obviously believes and what the audience obviously does not want to hear can succeed politically and, more important, move a people.

Since Robert Kennedy, in the insightful words of the conservative thinker, Jeffrey Bell, "no liberal leader has come close to uniting blacks and northern working-class whites." Never was that special appeal of RFK more apparent than on May 6, 1968, when his open convertibility was cheered by the crowds on the streets of Gary, Ind. On one side of the candidate was Tony Zale, a hometown hero to the Eastern European Americans and former middleweight champion, and on the other Richard Hatcher, the first black mayor of the city.

During the last quarter century of clear Republican dominance of our presidential politics, the GOP had been the warrior party of big shoulders, quick fists and growing defense budgets. During that same time, the Democrats had been the nurturing, compassionate, more traditionally maternal party, especially good with children, the sick and the elderly.

Uniquely, Robert Kennedy was both authentic warrior and genuine nurturer. Tough and combative, called "ruthless" by his elitist critics, Kennedy relentlessly preached a political gospel of compassion. His backbone was rock hard; his heart did bleed for all those who lived on the margin and in the shadows.

Earlier in Indianapolis, Robert Kennedy, according to *The Post's* David Broder, had "encountered the sharpest heckling of his Indiana campaign at the Indiana University Medical Center." Kennedy was there "booed and hissed as his observations on Social Security, segregation, the draft and the relationship of government and medicine drew strong opposition from many in his audience." One medical student demanded of Robert Kennedy: "Where are you going to get the money for all these federally subsidized programs you are talking about?" In reply, conspicuous for its concise candor, Kennedy made his campaign managers wince: "From you."

There was none of the old reliable politician's talk about waste, fraud and abuse or closing loopholes. Kennedy simply and straightforwardly spoke the allegedly unpalatable truth. He afflicted the comfortable.

Only three weeks later at Creighton University in Omaha, just two days before the Nebraska primary, Kennedy asked how many of his mostly college audience favored deferring students from the draft then in effect. The majority of the hands went up. Kennedy made no effort to conceal his indignation.

"Look around you. How many black faces do you see here? How many American Indians, how many Mexican Americans? . . . If you look at any regiment or division of paratroopers in Vietnam, 45 percent of them are black. You're the most exclusive minority in the world. Are you just going to sit on your duffs and do nothing or just carry signs in protest?"

In Indianapolis and Omaha, Robert Kennedy told all of us he knew he could not get everyone's vote, that he was willing to write off some constituencies. In Gary, Robert Kennedy offered a Democratic populist vision that embraced and appealed to both American blacks and American working-class whites.

RFK's populism argued that just as schools test students, communities ought to be able

to test their schools, that the federal welfare program was destructive and hurtful to the poor and that, because he believed in a government that was effective and energetic, decentralization of power away from Washington must be achieved. That was liberal heresy in 1968.

Full disclosure and the conflict of interest fever require that I reveal that I worked for Robert Kennedy in that 1968 campaign. And 25 years later, I still miss him.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, this week, citizens throughout the country are paying tribute to American farmers and ranchers. Having grown up on a family farm, it was with a sense of pride that I cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 36, proclaiming March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day."

America's leadership in agriculture is unequalled in the world. In no American workplace is there found the kind of hard work, productivity, cooperation, neighborly concern, creative use of applied science, and independence than on our farms and ranches. More than 200 different commodities are produced on more than 2 million farms in this country, either for domestic or foreign markets.

Agriculture as an industry contributes an estimates 21 million jobs, or 17 percent of the national work force, and accounts for nearly 16 percent of the gross national product. Annually, the United States exports over 40 billion dollars' worth of farm products, amounting to 12 percent of world farm trade. These exports reduce our deficit in nonfarm trade by 17 percent. Each dollar of those exports generates another \$1.59 in economic activity, much in the nonfarm sector.

Madam President, agriculture is America's No. 1 industry. American agriculture, in turn, is No. 1 in the world. American farmers grow about 50 percent of the world's soybeans, 40 percent of the world's corn, and 25 percent of the world's grain sorghum. American agricultural production totals \$138 billion—\$73.5 billion in crops and \$64.3 billion in livestock.

All of this means jobs. The U.S. food and fiber system provides jobs for more than 20 million people, from farmers to processors to supermarket clerks.

Each U.S. farmer and rancher supplies enough food and fiber for more than 128 people—94 people in this country and 34 abroad. The American farmer truly feeds the world. At home, U.S. consumers spend over \$500 billion each year on food.

Madam President, U.S. farmers and ranchers are already the most productive in the world. Yet, they continue working to improve their productivity. Output per acre was 40 percent higher in 1987 than in 1967. An hour of farm labor produces nearly eight times as much food and other crops in 1987 as it did in 1947.

My State of South Dakota is truly representative of American agriculture. Agriculture is South Dakota's No. 1 industry, and it is the Nations' No. 1 industry. Recently, South Dakota State University [SDSU] issued a report which measured the impact of South Dakota agriculture. The study shows that agriculture in South Dakota contributes \$13.2 billion to the State's economy. That amount is more than three times larger than any other single industry in the State. The SDSU study also explains that just a 1-percent increase in South Dakota's agricultural output would increase the State's industrial output by \$141 million, create 1,230 jobs, and increase wages by \$19 million.

Madam President, South Dakota is among the leading agricultural States in the Nation. Consider the following national rankings:

- No. 1 producer of oats;
- No. 2 producer of rye;
- No. 2 producer of flaxseed;
- No. 2 producer of sunflower seed;
- No. 5 producer of all hay;
- No. 6 producer of barley;
- No. 6 producer of all wheat;
- No. 9 producer of soybeans for beans; and
- No. 9 producer of corn.

Nationally, South Dakota also ranks 8th in cash receipts from farm marketings of cattle and calves, wheat, and barley; 9th in hogs and soybeans; 10th in sorghum grain; and 13th in corn. South Dakota is ranked 20th in the Nation in cash receipts from total farm marketings, 14th in livestock marketings, and 28th in crops. If South Dakota were a separate country, it would be among the top 10 corn-producing countries in the world.

South Dakota exported over \$750 million of agricultural products in 1990. Feed grains and products were the leading commodity, valued at \$247 million, followed by wheat, \$165 million, and soybeans, \$134 million. South Dakota also utilizes more ethanol than any other State in the Nation.

Madam President, that is quite impressive. The fine South Dakotans involved in agriculture can be justifiably proud of their contribution not only to South Dakota but to the Nation. The fine Americans producing our Nation's food and fiber can be justifiably proud as well. They have successfully met the challenges of recent years and are ready to confront the challenges that lie ahead. Their story is remarkable. It is one that is not told often enough, but it is one worth repeating over and over again.

Today we take off our hats to the American farmer. In no other sector of the world is there found greater productivity, dedication, or flexibility to survive in a constantly changing world. Let us all salute the fine Americans who contribute to making American agriculture the No. 1 industry in the world.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from a local South Dakota paper honoring National Agriculture Week in South Dakota be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Freeman Courier, Mar. 17, 1993]

SOUTH DAKOTA HONORS AGRICULTURE

Governor George S. Mickelson has officially proclaimed March 14-20, as National Agriculture Week in the state of South Dakota.

A news release from the South Dakota Department of Agriculture notes National Agriculture Week in South Dakota is a time to honor the people involved with the state's number one industry. Agriculture leads the way in providing a base for South Dakota's economy by employing more people than any other industry. The people involved with agriculture in South Dakota are extremely efficient and productive. Each farmer and rancher in the state produces enough food and fiber to feed well over 100 people. Their contribution to the economy of South Dakota is irreplaceable. Finally, the news release notes, this production is accomplished while serving as stewards and guardians of the environment which provides their livelihood.

In South Dakota, National Agriculture Week also recognizes the solid base that farm and ranch families provide for the rural communities of the state. The observance notes their work in religious, social, political, and business institutions contributes to the strong moral fiber of their communities and South Dakota. In addition, the young people of the farm and ranch communities provide a bright future for the progress of the state.

The efforts of the agriculture community often go unheralded, unnoticed and unappreciated, the South Dakota Department of Agriculture notes. Every day of the year Americans, not to mention people throughout the world, depend on the productivity of farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and the rest of the United States.

MORE NURSES, BETTER MEDICINE

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to call to your attention a readily available resource we have in our Nation to help solve the current crises of access to health care: America's nurses. They are eager and ready to help in providing primary care to our Nation. Recently, an article appeared in the New York Times by two nationally recognized nursing leaders, Linda Aiken and Claire Fagin, entitled "More Nurses, Better Medicine." It addressed both possibilities and roadblocks to enhanced utilization of nurses in our country that I believe we should consider.

Our Federal strategies to increase the number of primary care physicians have failed. It is estimated that it will take until 2040 to produce the required number of primary care physicians. Currently, only 14 percent of medical school graduates in 1992 are planning careers in primary care.

However, within nursing there exists a category of nurses called advanced

practitioners. These nurses are fully capable and qualified to answer the cries of our Nation for accessible, affordable, and quality health care. Advanced practice nurses have specialized training beyond their basic education. They serve as nurse practitioners, certified nurse-midwives, nurse anesthetists, and clinical nurse specialists.

Advanced practice nurses such as nurse practitioners can substitute for physicians for 90 percent of the primary care needed for children, and 60-80 percent required by adults. Numerous studies have documented the cost-effectiveness, and more importantly, the equal quality of utilizing advanced practice nurses, yet barriers remain. Restrictive laws and regulations must be removed to allow nurses in advanced practice to improve access to care. If we are to solve this Nation's health care dilemma, we must give consideration to the following suggestions:

Provide direct reimbursement through Medicaid and Medicare at the same rate as physicians;

Allot bonus payments to physicians and nurses that provide care in underserved areas;

Provide hospital admitting privileges to certified nurse midwives and nurse practitioners; and

Reallocate GME funds to support training of advanced practice nurses.

In addition to better utilization of nurses, it is important that we sponsor creative options to nurture our nurses through provision of expanded opportunities. One of the many opportunities currently available to nurses is a congressional fellowship. Fellowships and internships teach nurses to participate in the health policy process. I am very proud to say that I currently have two congressional nurse fellows in my office, Diana Kupchella and Rebecca Long, who are contributing valuable expertise to the development of health policy. We must continue to support nurses with such experiences in order to nurture a profession so disparately needed.

In pursuing our goal of achieving a functional and accessible health care system we must examine the alternatives. The Sun has set on our current health system. Soon, a new day will be on the horizon. I suggest that we look beyond the night and consider America's nurses as a bright ray of hope for the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks and the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1993]

MORE NURSES, BETTER MEDICINE

(By Linda Aiken and Claire Fagin)

PHILADELPHIA.—The U.S. has a shortage of primary-care physicians. This limits the options for improving access to cost-effective health care. Nurses are a national resource with the potential to meet this challenge.

Since the late 1960's, Federal policy has promoted two strategies to increase primary care. The first included Federal support for establishing a new physician specialty in family practice. It has not yet been successful. Between 1970 and 1990, the proportion of doctors in primary care declined, and the rate of decline is accelerating.

In contrast, the second strategy—employing advanced-practice nurses (nurse practitioners, clinical nurse specialists and nurse midwives)—has been enormously successful. Two decades of research, summarized last summer in the Yale Journal on Regulation, gives clear evidence that advanced-practice nurses provide care of comparable quality and at a lower cost than doctors do.

Advanced-practice nurses can safely substitute for physicians for up to 90 percent of primary care needed by children and 80 percent required by adults. The Yale report concluded that significant financial, legal and professional barriers prevent the effective use of nurses.

Yet nurse practitioners and nurse midwives prescribe fewer drugs, use fewer tests and select lower-cost treatment and settings.

Historically, nurses have been more likely than doctors to practice in areas where there is insufficient health care. Nurse anesthetists deliver 85 percent of anesthesia services in rural areas. Approximately one in five nurse practitioners and midwives practice in rural areas, and close to 50 percent of them work in inner cities.

International comparisons suggest that at least 75 percent of all prenatal care and delivery of babies could be safely provided by nurse midwives. But in the U.S., nurses deliver less than 4 percent of births.

The following ideas would lead to the more productive use of nurses:

To increase primary care for Medicaid recipients, nurse practitioners and certified nurse midwives should qualify for direct reimbursement at the same rate as physicians. Bonus payments should be given to doctors and nurses in underserved rural and urban areas.

Where fee-for-service arrangements exist, qualified nurses should be eligible for direct reimbursement by Medicare. This would save costs, not increase them.

Hospitals must be required to offer admitting privileges to nurse midwives and nurse practitioners as a condition of participation in Medicaid and Medicare. Without admitting privileges, nurses cannot practice under state, Medicare and Medicaid legal guidelines.

The high cost and uncertain availability of malpractice insurance for nurse midwives impede the growth of the midwifery practice. Malpractice insurance reform and possibly tort reform are required.

America needs a collaborative system where health care professionals are used appropriately and cost effectively. By better using nurses for primary care, the goals of national health care reform—improved access to appropriate services at affordable cost—can be achieved.

REAPPOINTMENT BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, his reappointment of Dr. Donald McCoy, of Kansas, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR— H.R. 416

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 416, an act to extend the period during which chapter 12 of title XI of the United States Code remains in effect, received today from the House, be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPITOL ROTUNDA COMMEMORATION FOR VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 39, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, a concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Capitol Rotunda; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that the preamble be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 13

Whereas, pursuant to such Act, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has designated April 18 through April 25, 1993, and April 3 through April 10, 1994, as "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust"; and

Whereas the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has recommended that a one-hour ceremony be held at noon on April 20, 1993, and at noon on April 6, 1994, consisting of speeches, readings, and musical presentations as part of the days of remembrance activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on April 20, 1993 from 8 o'clock ante meridian until 3 o'clock post meridian and on April 6, 1994, from 8 o'clock ante meridian until 3 o'clock post meridian for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill, previously received from the House of Representatives for concurrence and remaining undisposed of, was read the first and second times and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 416. An act to extend the period during which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code remains in effect, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish the National Resource Center for Grandparents; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 622. A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 623. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 to certain personnel matters of the Department of Affairs; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH:

S.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prayer in public schools and public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolution and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MATHEWS, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. Res. 81. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate with respect to the availability and affordability of health care coverage and services in our Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish the National Resource Center for Grandparents; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

NATIONAL GRANDPARENT RESOURCE CENTER ACT OF 1993

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I am joined by Senator COHEN in introducing the National Grandparent Resource Center Act of 1993. Congressman WILLIAM HUGHES, the acting chairman of the House Aging Committee, has introduced H.R. 1223, the House companion. This legislation would establish, under title II of the Older Americans Act, a national center of information and referral to grandparents who need assistance in raising their grandchildren, obtaining visitation rights or any number of other areas of need. This legislation represents an effort to begin to address the great need for in-

formation and support that the changing role of grandparents has created. Congressman Tom Downey and I first introduced the grandparents resource center bill last year. As many of you may know, Congressman Downey was one of the first Members of Congress to begin looking at these issues. While he was the chairman of the House Aging Committee's Subcommittee on Human Services, he worked diligently to help these grandparents and their grandchildren, and we all owe him a huge debt for bringing these very important concerns to our attention. I am pleased that Congressman HUGHES is taking up where Congressman Downey left off.

Members of the Senate Aging Committee, myself included, first became aware of this need last July at an Aging Committee hearing that examined the growing phenomenon of grandparents who are raising their grandchildren. The members of the committee heard powerful testimony that was both horrifying and poignant, appalling and uplifting. I would like to share some of what I learned that day.

It is difficult to know exactly how many American children are being raised—either solely or partly—by their grandparents, but estimates range anywhere from 3.2 million to upward of 4 million. This is an increase of about 40 percent in the past 10 years. The reasons for this dramatic increase are varied, but usually the natural parents are unwilling or unable to care for their children because of drug and/or alcohol abuse, divorce, teenage pregnancy, abandonment, physical or sexual abuse, death, imprisonment, or even murder.

Although you most often find grandparents raising their grandchildren in the inner cities, this trend cuts across all social, economic, ethnic, and racial lines. It is happening everywhere. In fact, many of us probably know someone who has had to take on the responsibility of caring for their grandchildren full-time. In July, I heard firsthand how this affects the grandparents—and the grandchildren—on an everyday basis.

Mrs. Joan McMillin of Bellflower, CA, shared some of the most powerful testimony I have ever heard at a Senate hearing. Her statement began with the story of her two small grandchildren witnessing the murder of their mother—Mrs. McMillin's daughter—by their father. With that began her and her husband's 3½-year struggle to gain permanent custody of their grandchildren.

She described how she and her husband were battered by the system—the complex structure of courts and child and family welfare agencies. They constantly had to battle the belief that they were too old to raise the children. The stress and strain caused her husband to have three strokes, forcing him to lose his business, their livelihood,

and their health insurance. Mrs. McMillin said that she and her husband used to be a typical middle-aged middle-class couple—her husband enjoying an occasional game of golf, and that she believed in shop til you drop. Now, by the end of the month, they often do not have enough food in the house.

The hardships that these grandparents are willing to endure to care for these children are truly awe-inspiring. They not only have the enormous strain on their finances and their health, but many have to contend with feelings of shame and failure, wondering where they may have gone wrong with their own children. Their marriages are under tremendous pressure, as are friendships and relationships with other family members. Some of them have aging relatives to care for as well. And all too often, the grandchildren themselves are emotionally troubled. Many of these children have seen things that we cannot even imagine.

Yet, these grandparents would have it no other way. Mrs. Mary Shaheen of Yarmouth, Maine, who was accompanied by her 11-year-old grandson Nathaniel whom she is raising, said, "I certainly would not have considered any other option. *** I sign his report card *** with the same pride and love as any parent who has brought their child into the world."

As I listened to the testimony, I wondered at these truly heroic efforts of so many seemingly ordinary people. How do they do it? Many grandparents point to the assistance they receive from various grandparents' support groups. Mrs. McMillin said that their local group, Grandparents as Parents, is what keeps her and her husband going. Others say they are just doing what they have to, and they try not to think too much about it.

So why does our system make it so difficult for grandparents to step in to raise these children? Why is it easier to place children in foster care than with a grandparent? Shouldn't we be doing things to encourage grandparents? Throughout history, they have played a vital role in family life. Some grandparents in Hope, AR, helped to raise a President of the United States. Mr. President, the legislation that we are introducing today is just one small step to begin to help these everyday heroes.

In the end, it is the children we need to protect. They are the ones who are most affected by the system, especially when it doesn't work. I cannot say it any better than 11-year-old Nate Shaheen: "I just have one thing to say. I think all grandchildren that live with their grandmas love it."

I urge my colleagues to join us in support of the National Grandparent Resource Center Act of 1993.●

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator PRYOR today in

introducing the Grandparents National Resource Center Act of 1993. This legislation recognizes the increased role of grandparents in today's society.

Millions of grandparents nationwide are starting over as parents. These seniors are trying to put their families back together, often in the face of huge bureaucratic, financial, and emotional obstacles.

The incidence of grandparents being thrust into parenthood a second time around is a clear indication of many of the societal ills this country is facing. Drug and alcohol addiction, sexual and physical abuse, murder, crime, divorce, teenage pregnancy, and AIDS, have reached epidemic proportion. They are crippling the American family and are forcing our grandparents back into parenthood to raise their children's children.

The elderly are among the hidden victims of these societal problems that are placing unforeseen responsibilities and burdens on the shoulders of our Nation's seniors.

Last year, the Senate Special Committee on Aging held a hearing on this issue. Senator PRYOR and I heard compelling, often tragic stories of the problems these seniors face. For example, grandparents must cope with the needs of drug-exposed infants, or children who bear the scars of physical or emotional abuse. In addition, at the same time that many grandparents are facing painful feelings of guilt about what went wrong with their own children, they must battle a complicated and expensive legal system, and fight to be recognized as the primary caregivers of their grandchildren.

The legislation that Senator PRYOR and I are introducing today will establish a National Grandparent Resource Center to serve as a central source of information and assistance to older individuals who are raising their grandchildren. The Center will provide a valuable reference for grandparents on legal, financial, and emotional support systems available to assist them in meeting the often unforeseen difficulties in raising their grandchildren. A toll-free number will be provided to increase access to the Center.

While this legislation is not a panacea for all of the problems facing this special group of grandparents, it is a step in the right direction. I will soon introduce a package of legislation that will address the bureaucratic barriers confronting grandparents raising their grandchildren in order to ease their struggle as they attempt to keep their families together.●

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 622. A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1993

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to reauthorize, for an additional 3 years, the Office of Special Counsel—the Government agency charged with protecting Federal employee whistleblowers. I am pleased that Senators PRYOR and COHEN, two long-time stalwarts in the battle to protect whistleblower rights, have agreed to join me as original cosponsors of this measure.

We all know that Federal employee whistleblowers save taxpayers dollars every day by helping to identify potential problems and wrongdoing at an early stage. These brave individuals deserve our respect and our thanks, but all too often they are threatened instead with on-the-job harassment, negative job ratings, unfavorable transfers, denial of promotions, and even dismissal.

Four years ago, Congress sought to address the problem by unanimously enacting the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, a landmark piece of legislation which offered whistleblowers substantial new job protections that were not previously available. I wrote and sponsored that legislation because of the compelling evidence that the existing system was not serving the interest of whistleblowers.

It is not enough, however, for Congress to enact new legislation. If whistleblowers are to be fully protected, the law must be faithfully implemented in the spirit in which it was written. Unfortunately, there is evidence that this has yet to be done. Although the record shows that the Office of Special Counsel has obtained corrective action for almost a hundred whistleblowers since the enactment of the Whistleblower Protection Act, a recent GAO report reveals that far more have been left to pursue relief on their own.

The GAO report shows that out of more than 1,000 cases brought to OSC under the Whistleblower Protection Act through the end of fiscal year 1991—OSC obtained corrective actions or favorable dispositions—that is settlements—in 57 cases.

Individual whistleblowers pursued 175 cases that were dropped by OSC, and obtained 52 settlements and 5 reversals. Individual whistleblowers, who gave up on OSC without waiting for their cases to be closed, achieved an additional 18 settlements or reversals.

Overall, these numbers indicate that 75 whistleblowers who originally sought help from OSC were able to get some form of relief on their own, compared to only 57 who were able to get relief through OSC. While there is no way to compare the results achieved in cases settled by OSC to those achieved in cases settled by individual whistleblowers, these statistics suggest that OSC may have given up on more meri-

torious whistleblower cases than it has pursued to a successful conclusion.

This record raises serious questions about the OSC's record of implementing the Whistleblower Protection Act. Simply put, if OSC's performance does not improve soon, we will have to give serious consideration to alternative approaches to whistleblower protection, including proposals to abolish the Office of Special Counsel altogether.

Mr. President, the bill that I am introducing with Senators PRYOR and COHEN today, would reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel for another 3 years, while at the same time addressing some of the problems we have had with the performance of this office. I first introduced this bill last year, and it was approved by the Governmental Affairs Committee and the full Senate in the last Congress, but died at the end of the session when the House failed to act.

The most important limitation placed on the Office of Special Counsel by this bill is the limited reauthorization period—substantially less than the 5 years originally requested by OSC. The bill that we are introducing today would extend the authorization of the Office of Special Counsel, but only for 3 years.

This reauthorization gives the Office of Special Counsel an opportunity to improve its operations and become more aggressive in its efforts to protect whistleblowers. At the same time, the short period of the reauthorization should keep the office on a short leash and put it on notice that improvements are expected. If OSC fails to become more aggressive in its efforts to protect whistleblowers, we will have to consider more significant changes to the statute 3 years from now.

The bill contains a number of other provisions that would clarify provisions of the Whistleblower Protection Act, address issues raised in last year's hearings, and ensure that the statute operates as intended. In particular, the bill would—

First, extend the coverage of the Whistleblower Protection Act to employees of Federal corporations;

Second, clarify the rules governing OSC disclosure of information about whistleblowers;

Third, require OSC to debrief, upon request, whistleblowers whose cases have been terminated;

Fourth, establish a fixed time limit for OSC to take action on whistleblower cases; and

Fifth, make several other minor changes to the act.

On the first point, some categories of employees—those who work for entities which are not agencies of the Federal Government but which are directly related to the Federal Government—are not covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act. This is because the Whistleblower Protection Act is

codified as a part of the civil service laws, and those laws specifically exempt employees of federally owned corporations from their coverage. Although such employees are commonly viewed as Federal employees, they are not covered by the requirements and protections of the civil service laws and that means they are not subject to the benefits of the Whistleblower Protection Act.

There are important reasons for exempting Government corporations from some of the laws governing other Federal agencies. In some cases, we may want to encourage the use of innovative management techniques. In other cases, we may want Government corporations to run like private businesses, so we choose to give them latitude in the management of their personnel. However, this does not mean that we intend to allow employees in these corporations who blow the whistle on fraud, waste, or mismanagement to be without protection from, or a remedy for, retaliation, since significant amounts of taxpayer dollars are at stake.

These Federal corporations include the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, and Federal Prison Industries.

Each of these corporations exercises significant Federal regulatory or management responsibilities, and whistleblowers in their ranks deserve the same protections as other Federal employees. The provision in our bill—which was not included in last year's bill—would ensure that these public servants have a remedy if they are subject to retaliation when they disclose fraud, waste, or abuse in the Federal Government.

On the second point, section 1212(g) of the statute already prohibits the Office of Special Counsel from releasing any information about a whistleblower's case, except in accordance with the Privacy Act.

Despite this provision, however, many whistleblowers believe that OSC routinely releases information about whistleblowers to their employing agencies. While OSC denies any improper release of information, it also insists that section 1212(g) does not in any way restrict its ability to use information about whistleblowers during the course of an investigation in any way it pleases.

The Office of Special Counsel obviously needs to use information during investigations, and in some cases, use necessarily requires disclosure. In other cases, however, disclosure may

be seriously detrimental to the interest of a whistleblower. OSC's insistence on absolute discretion to use information in any way it pleases has undermined confidence in the Office, and may even subject some whistleblowers to needless harassment.

Like last year's bill, this year's bill would clarify the existing statutory provision on the release of information and require OSC to develop a policy addressing types of information that may, and may not, be disclosed to agency officials without the consent of the whistleblower. This approach would address the problem of OSC releasing confidential information without limiting the office's ability to conduct investigations.

On the third point, the statute currently requires OSC to provide a close-out letter to whistleblowers whose cases are terminated. Each such letter is statutorily required to include a summary of the relevant facts ascertained by the Special Counsel, including the facts that support, and the facts that do not support, the whistleblower's allegations.

However, many whistleblowers complain that OSC's close-out letters are perfunctory, and give little information about OSC's investigation or the facts of the case. Some have sought to remedy this problem by gaining access to the OSC's investigative files.

Giving whistleblowers a right of access to OSC investigative files may not be appropriate, because such files might contain confidential information about persons other than the whistleblower. Also, witnesses might be less candid with OSC investigators if they knew that OSC files would be open to the whistleblower. On the other hand, OSC is statutorily required to assist whistleblowers, and should not treat them the same way as any Federal agency would treat a routine FOIA request.

This year's bill, like last year's, would address this problem by requiring OSC to provide each whistleblower whose case is closed with the name of an OSC employee who will be available to respond to reasonable questions about the case. This change would give whistleblowers greater access to OSC information without going to the extreme of opening OSC investigative files to individual whistleblowers.

On the fourth point, section 1214(b)(2)(A) of the statute states that if OSC finds reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has occurred, it must notify the agency and give it an opportunity to correct the problem. Section 1214(b)(2)(B) then provides that if, after a reasonable period of time, the agency does not act to correct the prohibited personnel practice, the Special Counsel may petition the Board for corrective action.

However, OSC has informed us that only one determination has ever been

made under 1214(b)(2)(A). Instead of utilizing the statutory mechanism, OSC has chosen to pursue open-ended negotiations with the agency, leaving the whistleblower hanging. For this reason, we learned last year that OSC had 21 pending whistleblower investigations that had been open for an average of about 1½ years, but had not made a reasonable grounds determination in a single case.

This year's bill, like last year's, would address this issue by establishing a fixed schedule for OSC to take action. In particular, OSC would be given 240 days to make a determination whether or not there was a reasonable basis to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has taken place. This period could be extended, if necessary for OSC to complete its investigation, but only with the consent of the whistleblower.

The other changes carried over from last year's bill would: (a) Conform the discovery standard in whistleblower cases to the standard in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (b) clarify that a prevailing whistleblower is entitled to attorneys' fees and any other reasonable costs incurred directly or indirectly by the whistleblower; (c) clarify that an agency decision to ordering psychiatric testing or examination of employees is a personnel action, subject to review in a whistleblower case; and (d) allow a Special Counsel to serve beyond the 5-year term, if necessary to prevent a vacancy in the Office.

In addition to the provisions carried over from last year, this year's bill would: (a) Reauthorize MSPB for an additional year, to put it on the same authorization cycle as OSC; (b) require MSPB to refer possible prohibited personnel practices identified in independent right of action cases to OSC to take appropriate action; (c) limit the exclusion of confidential, policymaking positions to those that are designated prior to the personnel action; and (d) make compliance with merit systems principles a consideration in performance appraisals of Federal managers.

Mr. President, the successful operation of the Whistleblower Protection Act is dependent in large part on the agency primarily charged with enforcing that act—the Office of Special Counsel. This bill sends a message to the Special Counsel and to the Office as a whole that we take the protection of whistleblowers seriously, and that we expect and intend them to be aggressive in pursuing the vindication of whistleblower rights. I hope that our colleagues will join us in supporting this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.—Section 8(a)(1) of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note; Public Law 101-12; 103 Stat. 34) is amended by striking out “1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994” and inserting in lieu thereof “1993, 1994, and 1995”.

(b) OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 8(a)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note; Public Law 101-12; 103 Stat. 34) is amended by striking out “1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992” and inserting in lieu thereof “1993, 1994, and 1995”.

SEC. 2. OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.

(a) SUCCESSION.—Section 1211(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence: “The Special Counsel may continue to serve beyond the expiration of the term until a successor is appointed and has qualified, except that the Special Counsel may not continue to serve for more than one year after the date on which the term of the Special Counsel would otherwise expire under this subsection.”.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURES.—Section 1212(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out “provide information concerning” and inserting in lieu thereof “disclose any information from or about”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking out “a matter described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 2302(b)(2) in connection with a” and inserting in lieu thereof “an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, general qualifications, character, loyalty, or suitability for any personnel action of any”.

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—Section 1214(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (B), (C) and (D), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following:

“(A)(i) Except as provided under clause (ii), no later than 240 days after the date of receiving an allegation of a prohibited personnel practice under paragraph (1), the Special Counsel shall make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has occurred, exists, or is to be taken.

“(ii) If the Special Counsel is unable to make the required determination within the 240-day period specified under clause (i) and the person submitting the allegation of a prohibited personnel practice agrees to an extension of time, the determination shall be made within such additional period of time as shall be agreed upon between the Special Counsel and the person submitting the allegation.”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) A determination by the Special Counsel under this paragraph may not be admissible as evidence in any judicial or administrative proceeding, without the consent of the person submitting the allegation of a prohibited personnel practice.”.

(d) REPORTS.—Section 1218 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “cases in which it did not make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice

has occurred, exists, or is to be taken within the 240-day period specified in section 1214(b)(2)(A)(i),” after “investigations conducted by it.”.

SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) SUBPOENAS.—Section 1221(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(1) At the request of an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment seeking corrective action under subsection (a), the Board shall issue a subpoena for the attendance and testimony of any person or the production of documentary or other evidence from any person if the Board finds that the testimony or production requested is not unduly burdensome and appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.”.

(b) REFERRALS.—Section 1221(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) If, based on evidence presented to it under this section, the Merit Systems Protection Board determines that there is reason to believe that a current employee may have committed a prohibited personnel practice, the Board shall refer the matter to the Special Counsel to investigate and take appropriate action under section 1215.”.

(c) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Section 1221(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out “and any other reasonable costs incurred” and inserting in lieu thereof “and any other reasonable costs incurred directly or indirectly by the employee, former employee, or applicant.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking out “and any other reasonable costs incurred,” and inserting in lieu thereof “and any other reasonable costs incurred directly or indirectly by the employee, former employee, or applicant.”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

(a) PERSONNEL ACTIONS.—Section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (ix) by striking out “and” after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating clause (x) as clause (xi) and inserting before such clause the following:

“(x) a decision to order psychiatric testing or examination; and”; and

(3) in the matter following designated clause (xi) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, and in the case of an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in subsection (b)(8), an employee or applicant for employment in a Government corporation as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code”.

(b) COVERED POSITIONS.—Section 2302(a)(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) ‘covered position’ means, with respect to any personnel action, any position in the competitive service, a career appointee position in the Senior Executive Service, or a position in the excepted service, but does not include any position which is, prior to the personnel action—

“(i) excepted from the competitive service because of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character; or

“(ii) excluded from the coverage of this section by the President based on a determination by the President that it is necessary and warranted by conditions of good administration.”.

(c) AGENCIES.—Section 2302(a)(2)(C) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in clause (i) by inserting before the semicolon: “, except in the case of an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in subsection (b)(8)”.

(d) INFORMATIONAL PROGRAM.—Section 2302(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period “, and for ensuring (in consultation with the Office of Special Counsel) that agency employees are informed of the rights and remedies available to them under this chapter and chapter 12 of this title”.

SEC. 5. PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS.

Section 4313(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(5) meeting affirmative action goals, achievement of equal employment opportunity requirements, and compliance with the merit systems principles set forth in section 2301 of this title.”.

SEC. 6. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) POLICY STATEMENT.—No later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Special Counsel shall issue a policy statement regarding the implementation of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989. Such policy statement shall be made available to each person alleging a prohibited personnel practice described under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code, and shall include detailed guidelines identifying specific categories of information that may (or may not) be communicated to agency officials for an investigative purpose, or for the purpose of obtaining corrective action under section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, or disciplinary action under section 1215 of such title, the circumstances under which such information is likely to be disclosed, and whether or not the consent of any person is required in advance of any such communication.

(b) TERMINATION STATEMENT.—The Special Counsel shall include in any letter terminating an investigation under section 1214(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, the name and telephone number of an employee of the Special Counsel who is available to respond to reasonable questions from the person regarding the investigation or review conducted by the Special Counsel, the relevant facts ascertained by the Special Counsel, and the law applicable to the person's allegations.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be effective on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senators LEVIN and COHEN in introducing legislation to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel. Similar legislation was approved by the Senate last year, however, the House did not act on the bill. The Office of Special Counsel [OSC], therefore, is currently operating without authorization.

The Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 established the Office of Special Counsel as an independent agency with the mandate to protect employees, especially whistleblowers, from prohibited personnel practices. The Whistleblower Protection Act was the result of years of effort and was intended to address deficiencies in the operations of the OSC. The act, among other things, established a simpler and fairer stand-

ard for whistleblowers in proving retaliation and gave whistleblowers increased procedural protections and guarantees of confidentiality.

While the OSC has shown some improvement in dealing with whistleblowers, my subcommittee continues to hear from people who have had disappointing and frustrating encounters with the OSC. These experiences, in large part, are the reason why the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee did not reauthorize OSC.

The bill we are introducing today would reauthorize OSC for 3 years. It would also clarify the rules governing OSC disclosure of information about whistleblowers, require the OSC to provide detailed information to employees when their cases are terminated, and establish a 240-day time limit for OSC to make a determination regarding whistleblower cases.

Mr. President, Congress relies on whistleblowers to bring to our attention information on problems within the Government that otherwise we would never find. Whistleblowers often act at their peril and we must do all that we can to ensure that whistleblowers are not punished for their actions. This bill makes some improvements to the Whistleblower Protection Act to make their plight somewhat easier. I look forward to working with Senators LEVIN and COHEN on this legislation.

By Mr. ROTH:

S.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prayer in public schools and public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

• Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation to restore voluntary prayer to our Nation's public schools. This amendment is essentially identical to legislation which I have introduced in previous Congresses. It would restore freedom of worship to our public schools, and would restore a right of local control over schools which the Supreme Court usurped in the Engel versus Vitale case decided over three decades ago.

In Engel in 1962, and again in Abington School District versus Schempp in 1963, the Court held that State-sponsored prayer or Bible reading in public schools violates the first amendment to the Constitution. The holdings in these cases, which have been reaffirmed and elaborated on in Lemon versus Kurtzman (1971), Wallace versus Jaffree (1984), and other cases, deny the State authority to conduct or prescribe almost any religious exercise or display—even when participation is voluntary. They still remain in force, and the law of the land.

Mr. President, although three decades have passed since the Supreme

Court decided these cases, public reaction to the decisions remains strong. Throughout our Nation, there is strong support for voluntary prayer in public schools. In the State of Delaware, surveys which I have conducted indicate that nearly 80 percent of those polled favor a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in public schools.

The amendment which I am introducing would guarantee the right of all persons “lawfully assembled, in any public school or other public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in voluntary prayer.” This amendment is not aimed at imposing a particular religion on any individual. The Constitution bars this in its prescription of Government establishment of an official religion. The Constitution does not, however, deny individuals the right to pray if they so wish. Indeed, it does just the opposite. I believe that our forefathers devised the Constitution to guarantee and preserve the freedom of religion rather than the freedom from religion. It seems incongruous that this Nation, whose birth certificate invoked the blessing of God upon its struggle for freedom, should now outlaw prayer—even voluntary prayer—in public schools.

Mr. President, there is a wave of violence sweeping through our Nation's primary and secondary schools which is robbing America's children of the quality of education to which they are entitled. While school prayer can never be an effective substitute for parental guidance or religious training, I believe the return of school prayers would help restore a sense of individual morality that at times seems forgotten. It is not too farfetched to believe that there may be some correlation between the total absence of prayer or meditative silence in schools and this wave of violence that is plaguing our educational institutions.

Mr. President, it is time that we stop denying our children the right to reaffirm their faith and dependence on God. It is time for Congress to give effect to the public outcry for action. Let us not allow three more decades to pass before we act on this most important matter.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk my proposed constitutional amendment in supportive of prayer in public schools and ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be

valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

“ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public school or other public building that is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in voluntary prayer.

“SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”•

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 623. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 to certain personnel matters of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR DVA
EMPLOYEES ACT OF 1993

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, a number of health care employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Fargo, ND, have written to me regarding their concern that DVA medical personnel, especially those individuals who report irregularities or other inappropriate medical care at VA medical centers, are not adequately protected under the Whistleblower Protection Act, Public Law 101-12, title 5.

Department of Veterans Affairs employees have reported that section 7425b of title 38 supersedes title 5 and exempts DVA health care workers under title 38 from the provisions of the Whistleblower Protection Act.

I have also been informed that a report, dated November 9, 1992, by the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, on deficiencies in the Department of Veterans Affairs medical quality assurance program confirms that DVA medical employees are exempt from the provisions of the Whistleblower Protection Act.

The report, entitled “Continuing Deficiencies in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Quality Assurance Program,” discusses how DVA employees who report fraud, abuse, and other inappropriate medical care at DVA medical facilities have been subject to harassment, intimidation, and other deplorable treatment by DVA management or supervisory personnel. The report describes numerous instances of employees who have lost their jobs in the Department and had their lives severely disrupted as a result of their attempts to expose poor quality patient care at DVA medical facilities—all the result of not having adequate protection under the Whistleblower Protection Act.

The Committee on Government Operations recommends (H. Rept. 102-1062) that legislative action be taken to en-

sure that title 38 employees are not exempt from the provisions under title 5, the Whistleblower Protection Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings, part D and recommendations of House Report 102-1062, which relate to the reporting of VA patient care and whistleblower protection for DVA employees, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I am very concerned that health care personnel in the Department of Veterans Affairs are not adequately protected under the provisions of the Whistleblower Protection Act. There is no question that VA employees must be covered under this act, not only to ensure that workers are protected against harassment, intimidation, and job loss but also to assure veterans that they are receiving the highest quality health care at VA medical facilities. This can only be accomplished by encouraging the medical staff to report fraud, patient abuse, and other inappropriate medical care at DVA health care facilities.

To assure veterans that the quality of patient care is one of the highest priorities at Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, and to protect dedicated VA employees who report irregularities at DVA medical centers, I am introducing legislation today to clarify that the provisions of the Whistleblower Protection Act (title 5) apply to title 38 health care employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs—the exemption of title 38 medical workers from the provisions of title 5 would end.

I am especially pleased that my colleague and distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, Senator DANIEL AKAKA, is joining as an original sponsor of this important legislation.

I urge the Members of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs to review the concerns of DVA health care employees regarding whistleblower protection as soon as possible, and to report a measure to the Senate that will assure VA employees that they are adequately protected when they report patient abuse or other inappropriate medical care at VA medical centers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF ACT.

(a) OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—(1) Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1216 the following new section:

“§ 1216a. Jurisdiction over certain Department of Veterans Affairs personnel matters

“The provisions of this subchapter shall apply with respect to health-care profes-

sionals who are employed by the Veterans Health Administration and appointed under section 7306, 7401(1), 7405, or 7406 of title 38, former health-care professionals who were so employed and appointed, and applicants for positions of such employment and appointment.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 12 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1216 the following new item:

“1216a. Jurisdiction over certain Department of Veterans Affairs personnel matters.”.

(b) INDIVIDUAL RIGHT OF ACTION.—(1) Subchapter III of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 1222 as section 1223; and

(B) by inserting after section 1221 the following new section 1222:

“§ 1222. Jurisdiction over certain Department of Veterans Affairs personnel matters

“The provisions of this subchapter shall apply with respect to health-care professionals who are employed by the Veterans Health Administration and appointed under section 7306, 7401(1), 7405, or 7406 of title 38, former health-care professionals who were so employed and appointed, and applicants for positions of such employment and appointment.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 12 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 1222 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new items:

“1222. Jurisdiction over certain Department of Veterans Affairs personnel matters.

“1223. Availability of other remedies.”.

(c) PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) Paragraphs (8) and (9) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to health-care professionals who are employed by the Veterans Health Administration and appointed under section 7306, 7401(1), 7405, or 7406 of title 38, former health-care professionals who were so employed and appointed, and applicants for positions of such employment and appointment.”.

(d) PREFERENCE IN TRANSFERS.—Section 3352 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to health-care professionals employed by the Veterans Health Administration and appointed under section 7306, 7401(1), 7405, or 7406 of title 38.”.

(e) APPELLATE PROCEDURES.—Section 7701(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) The provisions of this paragraph shall apply with respect to health-care professionals who are employed by the Veterans Health Administration and appointed under section 7306, 7401(1), 7405, or 7406 of title 38, and applicants for positions of such employment and appointment.”.

[(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) through (e) shall take effect as if included in the provisions of Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Personnel Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-40; 105 Stat. 187) to which such amendments relate.]

CONTINUING DEFICIENCIES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

D. THE DVA DISCOURAGES THE REPORTING OF POOR QUALITY CARE BY HARASSING WHISTLEBLOWERS OR FIRING THEM

According to Tom Devine, director of the Government Accountability Project, "The Department of Veterans Affairs in a leader on the merit system anti-honor roll for one simple reason: free speech repression has been a way of life at this agency."⁴² The subcommittee's investigation of the treatment of whistleblowers by the DVA confirms this characterization. Honest employees have had their jobs eliminated and their lives destroyed because they attempted to expose poor patient care.

One whistleblower's case is illustrative. James Nash is a physician's assistant at the DVA medical center in Cheyenne, WY. In March 1991, he discovered that patients diagnosed with cancer had not been informed of the results of their tests. The hospital's urologist had left, and no one had followed up with the patients whom he had tested for cancer. Four months later, the departed urologist had not been replaced, and the patients still had not been informed that they had cancer.⁴³

Nash notified his superiors at the hospital about the situation, and was told the patients would be treated at the DVA medical center in Denver. But he began receiving telephone calls from the patients in August, and learned that they had not been contacted. By September, frustrated that the patients had not been informed of their cancers more than 6 months after the tests, Nash told his story to local newspapers.⁴⁴

On September 16, 1991, the day after Nash went to the press, he was relieved of his duties as a physician's assistant and transferred to the library, where he had no work to do. Later, he was scheduled for a physical examination that was expected to lead to a forced removal from his job because of a back injury that he had, but that had never prevented him from doing his assignments.⁴⁵

Only after the intervention of the subcommittee was Nash's job restored. The DVA conducted an investigation of the Cheyenne situation and concluded that Nash had been correct. The hospital director was reassigned and improvements were made at the facility, including the hiring of a urologist. All the evidence indicates that, had it not been for the subcommittee's review of this matter, Nash would have been fired instead of recognized as the hero that he was.

Dr. Mary Brothers, a surgeon at the DVA medical center in Leavenworth, KS, was not so lucky. In 1980, while Dr. Brothers was working as a part-time staff surgeon at the hospital, she observed an attempt by the hospital administration to fire the facilities chief surgeon. The chief surgeon had made allegations—later proven to be accurate—that a physician at the hospital was conducting fraudulent drug research. When Dr. Brothers supported the chief surgeon and confirmed the allegations of fraud, she was dismissed. The chief surgeon was demoted and transferred to another hospital.⁴⁶

Dr. Brothers sued the DVA, and in 1987 won a jury award of more than \$100,000 in damages. The award was overturned by an appellate court, which ruled that the Merit Systems Protection Board was the appropriate venue for adjudication of the complaint.⁴⁷

Dr. David Shaller, a rheumatologist at the DVA hospital in Wilkes-Barre, PA, was fired for attempting to expose poor patient care. Dr. Shaller complained about the transfer of

seriously ill patients to the facility's nursing home care unit, which he believed was not equipped to care for the patients.⁴⁸

The hospital investigated Dr. Shaller's allegations and concluded they had no validity. He appealed their decision to the regional office on July 8, 1988. Several weeks later, the DVA inspector general received anonymous allegations charging Dr. Shaller with sexual misconduct. The allegations were disproved.⁴⁹

Two months later, Dr. Shaller was assigned to nursing duties in the hospital. When he discovered additional patient care problems, he reported them to Central Office. He also reported the allegations to another DVA physician and the head of a medical commission. He was fired for releasing patient information, even though he was attempting to obtain better treatment for the patients.⁵⁰

The committee believes these examples are typical of the treatment received by DVA whistleblowers. The Department is able to harass and intimidate its employees because of provisions contained in title 38 of the U.S. Code that exempt all medical employees of the Department from the Whistleblower Protection Act. According to Bruce Stark, an attorney who specializes in defending Government whistleblowers, the exemptions give the DVA "... nearly dictatorial power over its medical personnel, and none of the protections for whistleblowers accorded other federal employees."⁵¹ His advice to DVA medical personnel is, "Don't be a whistleblower."⁵²

Stark described the case of one of his clients: "Dr. Maxwell was put on display in the hospital library and finally relegated to taking photographs of employees for new identification badges in the personnel office. One can imagine the humiliation this caused Dr. Maxwell, who has worked for the Swedish Public Health Service, teaching oral surgery; who has taught oral surgery in Zurich, Switzerland; who was an oral surgeon for the Virginia Health Service, and had been a dental consultant to the National Health Service Corporation, under the U.S. Public Health Service. One need not be an M.D. to get the message that if you are a whistleblower you will be fired or forced out of the hospital in public disgrace. Your years of education will be lost and your reputation left in shreds. Such a despotic system does not attract the best medical professionals nor retain them once they learn about the system."⁵³

The committee believes that, in light of the failure of the DVA quality assurance system to prevent and correct poor medical treatment, the Department's punishment of personnel who attempt to expose poor quality care closes out the last possible mechanism within the hospital system to address problems. Unless the DVA changes its policies and procedures, the poor quality of care provided to veterans will remain known only to those who provide it.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. THE QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAMS AT THE DVA CENTRAL OFFICE MUST ESTABLISH AN IMPROVED SYSTEM OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE MEDICAL CENTERS THEY OVERSEE

In the committee's view, the major cause of the continuing failure of the DVA's quality assurance system is its lack of information about the actual level of quality of care in each of the medical centers managed by the Department. Since the inception of veterans health care, the hospitals have behaved as if they were islands, insulated from oversight. The medical centers have been irresponsible and cavalier about reporting re-

quirements, and cases involving the most serious types of malpractice are not reported at all.

The hospitals have an incentive to provide inaccurate reports, because they want to maintain good images with their superiors in Washington. Further, physicians have an incentive to not report poor quality that had been covered up because they will almost certainly be punished if they do.

In light of these weaknesses in self-reporting, the committee believes it is foolish for Central Office to continue to rely on an antiquated system. There are better alternatives.

The committee recommends that the Department increase the number of site visits to facilities to examine medical records. The committee also recommends that the DVA make better use of its ability to retrieve computer data from patient treatment files. The subcommittee's exercise proved that data can be retrieved to identify quality problems.

The Department can improve on the subcommittee's demonstration. For example, the patient treatment files do not contain the best possible information, and the committee recommends that the files be modified to include specific data that can be used to identify quality of care problems. Also, the hospitals need to provide uniform information that can be used effectively. Under the current haphazard reporting system, it is sometimes impossible to detect systemic problems because comparable reporting is not achieved from the medical centers.

B. SUPERVISION OF RESIDENTS AND INTERNS IS INADEQUATE AND SHOULD BE IMPROVED

The subcommittee's investigation showed that supervision of residents and interns is not always taken seriously by DVA physicians. The view of one physician mentioned earlier in this report, that he has to sign supervisory forms at private hospitals because insurance will not reimburse him otherwise, but feels no incentive to do so at DVA facilities, is an attitude that appears pervasive in the system.

The committee believes it would be a simple matter for the DVA to require that all supervisory forms be signed, and that if they are not, disciplinary action will be taken. Otherwise, unsupervised and inexperienced physicians will continue to treat veterans, raising the risk of poor quality care.

C. THE CREDENTIALING AND PRIVILEGING SYSTEM IS NOT MEETING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS AND MUST BE IMPROVED

Ensuring good quality care begins with the hiring of competent medical staff. The IG's most recent investigation found the same problems identified by the subcommittee's earlier investigation. Hospitals are not verifying the records of physicians upon hiring and quality assurance information is not used in the renewal of privileges.

As in the case of unsupervised medical staff, the committee recommends that disciplinary action be taken in cases where routine verification of credentials and privileging data is not conducted.

D. EXEMPTIONS OF THE WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT CONTAINED IN TITLE 38 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE SHOULD BE OVERTURNED BY THE U.S. CONGRESS

The subcommittee's investigation revealed the deplorable treatment of medical personnel who attempt to expose poor quality care. DVA management has often behaved unconscionably in punishing whistleblowers, and has acted with impunity because the employees have no protection.

The committee can ascertain no benefit from exempting DVA title 38 employees from the Whistleblower Protection Act—only harm. We strongly urge the appropriate legislative committees to consider this recommendation and take action to repeal the title 38 exemption.

Moreover, the committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs review the Department's record in the handling of whistleblowers and provide guarantees that such retaliation will no longer be tolerated.

FOOTNOTES

- ⁴² Ibid., testimony of Tom Devine, director, Government Accountability Project, transcript p. 194.
⁴³ Ibid., testimony of James Nash, transcript p. 165.
⁴⁴ Ibid.
⁴⁵ Ibid., transcript p. 168.
⁴⁶ Ibid., testimony of Dr. Mary Brothers, transcript pp. 169 to 171.
⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 174.
⁴⁸ Ibid., testimony of David Shaller, transcript p. 181.
⁴⁹ Ibid.
⁵⁰ Ibid.
⁵¹ Hearings, testimony of Bruce Stark, transcript p. 157.
⁵² Ibid.
⁵³ Ibid., transcript p. 161.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 66

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 66, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to enhance educational opportunity, increase school attendance, and promote self-sufficiency among welfare recipients.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 81, a bill to require analysis and estimates of the likely impact of Federal legislation and regulations upon the private sector and State and local governments, and for other purposes.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to ensure that agencies establish the appropriate procedures for assessing whether or not regulation may result in the taking of private property, so as to avoid such where possible.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to protect children from exposure to environmental tobacco smoke in the provision of children's services, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate guidelines for instituting a nonsmoking policy in buildings owned or leased by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to make additional frequencies available for commercial assignment in order to promote the development and use of new telecommunications technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 416

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 416, a bill to authorize the provision of assistance to the victims of war in the former Yugoslavia, including the victims of torture, rape, and other war crimes and their families.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 440, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to control the diversion of certain chemicals used in the illicit production of controlled substances, to provide greater flexibility in the regulatory controls placed on the legitimate commerce in those chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of rural health-care clinics, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend chapter 41 of title 18, United States Code, to punish stalking.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 481, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the live performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such Act to employers and employees in the construction industry, and for other purposes.

S. 485

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 485, a bill to amend the

Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require motor vehicle damage disclosure.

S. 620

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 620, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to overturn the new limitations placed on private enforceability of State plan requirements by *Suter v. Artist M.*, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 49

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

CRAIG], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 49, a joint resolution to designate the week of March 28, 1993, through April 3, 1993, as "Distance Learning Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 52

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 52, joint resolution to designate the month of November 1993 and 1994 as "National Hospice Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 54

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 54, a joint resolution designating April 9, 1993,

and April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 62

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 62, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 25, 1993, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO THE AVAILABILITY AND AFFORDABILITY OF HEALTH CARE COVERAGE AND SERVICES IN OUR NATION

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MATHEWS, and Mr. PRESSLER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

S. RES. 81

Whereas millions of American men, women, and children lack adequate access to health care and health insurance;

Whereas in 1992, health care spending in the United States exceeded \$838,000,000,000; and

Whereas the Department of Commerce predicts health care spending will increase by 12.1 percent in 1993; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is a shared interest of both the public and private sectors at the Federal, State, and local levels to provide access to high quality, affordable health care coverage and services for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and that collectively we commit ourselves to take the necessary steps towards that goal.

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, I listened with interest to my colleagues from both sides of the aisle discuss the importance and need for health care reform in our country. I regret that I was unable to participate in the discussions, but I would like to take this opportunity to offer a resolution I hope all my colleagues will support.

I come to the floor today knowing that few national issues are as important to Americans than health care reform. Millions of our fellow citizens are without health insurance or adequate access to medical care, and health care spending—which accounted for 13.2 percent of our gross domestic product in 1991—continues its rapid climb.

Those of us who have long been involved in health care reform know that there are no easy solutions to this crisis. While many may disagree on what path of reform is best to follow, we all share the common goal of expanding access to, and containing the costs of, medical care in our country. Proponents of all types of reform—from

pay or play to managed care—embrace this common goal.

The resolution that I offer today simply makes clear that health care reform is a top priority to the Senate. It recognizes our compatriots who lack adequate access to medical care, and the alarming increase in our Nation's health care spending. Most importantly, Mr. President, this resolution acknowledges the interest of both the public and private sector in providing health care coverage to all Americans, and it encourages the Senate to work towards this goal.

I want to emphasize that this resolution does not advocate any one method of reform. I leave this opportunity to individual Senators, many of whom have already introduced their own health care bills. With some 700,000 Kentuckians who are uninsured or underinsured, my State is not immune from this crisis, and I intend to offer my own suggestions for health care reform in the very near future.

I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support to this measure. In doing so, we unquestionably place health care reform among the Senate's top priorities.

Mr. President, I offer this resolution on behalf of myself and Senators MCCAIN, ROCKEFELLER, BURNS, SPECTER, MATHEWS, and PRESSLER. •

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

OMNIBUS CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

GRASSLEY (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 184

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. BOND, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as follows:

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$800,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$500,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 11, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 16 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 12, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 13, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$500,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$100,000,000.

On page 27, decrease the amount on line 23 by \$100,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$300,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$300,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$400,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$400,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$500,000,000.

On page 28, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$500,000,000.

On page 29, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$700,000,000.

On page 29, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$700,000,000.

On page 30, decrease the amount on line 24 by \$800,000,000.

On page 30, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$400,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$800,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$2,700,000,000.

On page 31, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 32, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 32, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$2,200,000,000.

On page 32, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$100,000,000.

On page 32, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$200,000,000.

On page 32, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$300,000,000.

On page 33, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$400,000,000.

On page 33, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$500,000,000.

On page 33, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$700,000,000.

On page 33, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$600,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$1,300,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 13 by \$1,900,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,800,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 34, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$3,200,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 6 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$600,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$500,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$1,100,000,000.

On page 35, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$900,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$1,400,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$2,600,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$2,500,000,000.

On page 36, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$600,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$600,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$1,100,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$1,800,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$1,700,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 37, decrease the amount on line 22 by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$100,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$100,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$600,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$600,000,000.

On page 38, decrease the amount on line 25 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 14 by \$4,900,000,000.

On page 39, decrease the amount on line 15 by \$4,900,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 7, decrease the amount on line 12 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 17 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 18 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 19 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 20 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 4, decrease the amount on line 21 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 7 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 8 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 9 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 10 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 8, decrease the amount on line 11 by \$103,900,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 1 by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 2 by \$17,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 3 by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 4 by \$65,700,000,000.

On page 5, decrease the amount on line 5 by \$103,900,000,000.

DECONCINI (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 185

Mr. DECONCINI (for himself, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BRADLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that the Community Policing ("Cops on the Beat") program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

WELLSTONE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 186

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. EXON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that any increase in revenues set forth in this resolution do not assume an energy tax or fee on nonconventional fuels, including solar, geothermal, wind, and biomass-derived fuels (including biomass-derived ethanol and methanol).

JEFFORDS AMENDMENT NO. 187

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. JEFFORDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the earmarking of funds for research and development has increased dramatically over the past few years; and

(2) this trend, if not reversed, threatens the scientific leadership and future growth of America.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) in allocating monies for research and development pursuant to this budget resolution, research and development activities funded under a competitive process should be given priority over those funded under a non-competitive process; and

(2) the funds allocated for earmarked research and development by the appropriate

tions subcommittees should not exceed the amount of funds allocated for such purposes in fiscal year 1991, fiscal year 1992, or fiscal year 1993, whichever is less.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR REGULATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation, Committee on Environment and Public Works, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, March 19, beginning at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the adequacy of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's rules and regulations to protect commercial nuclear powerplants against terrorism and sabotage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on January 21, 1993, Senator COHEN and I introduced a bill, S. 24, to reauthorize the independent counsel law. As everyone knows by now, the longest and most complex matter referred to an independent counsel has been the Iran-Contra case handled by Judge Lawrence Walsh.

Earlier this week, the Wall Street Journal ran an editorial concerning certain expenses incurred by Judge Walsh's office. I request that a copy be included in the RECORD at the end of my statement. The editorial was misleading in several respects, and I would like to set the record straight.

By law, the General Accounting Office [GAO] is required to conduct audits of each independent counsel office. When GAO audited several offices for the first time last year—including those of Judge Walsh, Arlin M. Adams, James R. Harper, James C. McKay, and Whitney North Seymour, Jr.—it found some instances of what it believed to be overpayments. These overpayments were for items such as erroneous compensation time, annual leave, travel reimbursement, and compensation—See GAO report, October 9, 1992, B-250044, "Financial Audit: Expenditures by Nine Independent Counsels," GAO/AFMD-93-1.

With respect to each of these five offices, GAO then applied its standard procedure to determine whether reimbursement of these overpayments should be required or whether repayment should be waived. GAO's analysis of such matters is governed by statute and regulation—5 U.S.C. 5584(a); 4 CFR 91.92. Under these rules, repayment is not required if GAO finds:

That the erroneous payment occurred through an administrative error and that there is no indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee *** having an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim. Generally, a waiver is precluded when an employee *** knows, or reasonably should know, that an erroneous payment has occurred.—4 CFR 91.5(b).

Relying on the work it performed in the course of its audits, GAO found that none of the overpayments to the five independent counsel offices were the result of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith, and that there was no evidence they knew or should have known of the errors. Accordingly, GAO waived repayment in each case, including Judge Walsh, and sent letters to that effect dated February 5, 1993, to each office.

Now, the Wall Street Journal in its editorial characterizes this whole process as a "pardon" for Judge Walsh. That is nonsense. It is the same thing that happens if an agency mistakenly calculates a departing employee's accrued annual leave and pays him too much. If the agency discovers the mistake after the fact—and it was an honest mistake, with no fraud involved and no way the employee could have known about it—a waiver is appropriate.

The Wall Street Journal makes another misleading claim about GAO's actions concerning Judge Walsh—that "the government will look the other way if some of the violations continue." Again, this just is not the case. What GAO really said is that there are some ambiguities in current law about how certain travel and subsistence expenses should be handled when an independent counsel and staff are away from their home base. Since the situation is not clear-cut, GAO said that it "would not object to continuation of these reimbursements in order to allow the Congress an opportunity to address the issue."

Again, Judge Walsh is not getting a "pardon" or any special treatment from GAO. Under similar circumstances, when GAO has found questionable payments and traced the problem to an ambiguous law, it gives the recipient the benefit of the doubt and flags the issue for Congress to clarify. As a matter of fact, the bill that Senator COHEN and I have introduced does just that. We address the issue of per diem and travel expenses so independent counsels and GAO will not have to grapple with this ambiguity in the future.

We hope that our bill to reauthorize the independent counsel moves quickly, fixes what needs to be fixed and improved, and gets the independent counsel system back on track where it belongs.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 15, 1993]

A PARDON FOR WALSH

Seems like only yesterday that Judge Lawrence Walsh was all over the networks denouncing George Bush's "outrageous" pardon of Caspar Weinberger. Well, it now turns out that the Government Accounting Office, also an arm of Congress, has just given Judge Walsh a pardon of his own for extensive violations of federal pay and procurement rules by his office. Better yet, the government will look the other way if some of the violations continue.

Last year, it was discovered that because of an "oversight" at the GAO, popularly known as Congress's watchdog agency, there hadn't been an audit of Mr. Walsh's office as the law required, since his probe began in 1987. So they scoured all the independent counsel, and discovered that Mr. Walsh's problems were the most severe. No wonder: His empire accounts for an astounding 90% of the \$43 million directly spent by all independent counsel since 1978.

Among other things, the GAO audit found that Mr. Walsh and his top deputy, Craig Gillen, had been reimbursed improperly by taxpayers for as much as \$78,000 in food and lodging. Other violations of government rules included using a government-leased vehicle and flying first class. And Messrs. Walsh and Gillen failed to pay required Washington, D.C., income taxes, despite living in the city during most of this period. They've since paid the taxes and a penalty.

Mr. Walsh bitterly disputed the GAO's findings. Then, in an October 5, 1992, letter to the Comptroller General he asked for a "waiver" of all overpayments and irregularities "made in the past and similar future disbursements for the limited period prior to the completion of our remaining activities." In short, Judge Walsh wanted a pardon—both past and future.

He got it. Last month Deputy Comptroller General Milton Socolar sent letters to Judge Walsh and to the other independent counsel waving the government's right to collect money for any violations. Mr. Socolar told us that the waiver "amounts to a forgiveness of legal obligations because there was no evidence of fraud or misrepresentation." He asked for an end to all unauthorized payments, but granted a waiver in the case of Judge Walsh's travel and lodging expenses and for future violations. The justification for this extraordinary dispensation is that since Congress had not provided for the reimbursement of expenses for an independent counsel who worked away from home, the government should pay for them anyway.

Now, when a citizens group called Americans for a Balanced Budget filed a Freedom of Information Act request for the financial records of Mr. Walsh's office, they were turned down. A January 21 letter said this "would be an unwarranted administrative burden." But that reason isn't one of the exemptions allowed under FOIA and is ludicrous given that the financial records were recently handed over to GAO auditors; Judge Walsh was informed that he was clearly violating FOIA rules, and last week his lawyers agreed to surrender the documents.

Having fought for and won his pardon, Judge Walsh could still run afoul of other ethics laws. There are questions about his hiring of a firm to stage a mock trial before 36 Washington, D.C., residents to test his prosecutorial case against Mr. Weinberger. Such a trail could have cost as much as \$50,000 and there are reports the contract was given to a San Francisco firm without taking any other bids. If so, that would be a

clear violation of federal contract law. The prosecutor's office says it believes it has complied with federal regulations. The biannual GAO audit of Mr. Walsh's office is due out shortly.

So Judge Walsh's legion of crusading attorneys keeps ticking, running the taxpayers' meter while it prepares its "final" (promise?) report on the Iran-Contra affair. The law that authorizes independent counsel expired last December 15, and it has yet to be renewed. Justice Department officials say they have "no jurisdiction" over Judge Walsh. Congress's watchdogs have just given his operation a blanket pardon for non-compliance with government rules.

Gosh, isn't there anyone out there other than us interested in getting some accountability into this unsupervised, uncontrolled creature of the '80s? How about the Reno Justice Department? How about the White House's ethicists?*

A TRIBUTE TO WEST POINT

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the historic town of West Point, located on the Ohio River just north of Fort Knox in Hardin County.

When I think of West Point, I immediately recall a small town with a monumental past. In fact, West Point's founding, only 3 days before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, signaled a colorful future for this river city.

West Point served as a Union outpost for Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman during the Civil War. Sherman's fort was the first in what proved to be a great courtship between West Point and the U.S. military. In fact, close ties are still maintained between West Point and nearby Fort Knox.

West Point also benefited from its location on the Ohio River. Residents take pride in the powerful shipping industry which once prospered in West Point. Many remnants from this era still exist thanks to the reluctance of residents to build a floodwall or move the city to higher grounds. Instead, the Ohio River has become a beacon for new residents who are intrigued by the historic waterway.

Today, citizens hope to draw on West Point's rich heritage to entice tourists to the town. Once in West Point, visitors are invited to concerts at the 500-seat West Point Country Opry. They may also take a stroll through the numerous craft and antique shops, and spend the night in one of the town's quaint bed and breakfasts. Whatever they choose, visitors are more than welcome in West Point.

Mr. President, I honor the people of West Point. Their desire to open their doors to guests and share their town's heritage makes West Point one of Kentucky's finest towns.

Mr. President, I ask that a recent article from Louisville's Courier Journal be submitted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TOWN'S HOPES FOR SURVIVAL ARE PINNED ON ARTS, CRAFTS

(By Joseph Gerth)

There aren't many places where people look forward to a traffic jam, but Richard Briggs is eagerly awaiting the next time the streets in West Point are in gridlock.

In his 67 years, traffic has come to a standstill only once—during a citywide yard sale last fall—and Briggs, the unofficial city historian, was out of town.

"I missed it and I'm sorry I did, but I hope it happens again this year," he said.

Residents still talk of the great West Point traffic jam and many of them see it as more evidence of the Hardin County river town's resurgence, which started with the opening two years ago of several craft stores and a country inn.

For many who travel Dixie Highway between Louisville and Fort Knox, West Point is little more than a traffic light and an old, dilapidated motel that sits empty on the side of the road.

But turn off Dixie Highway and you'll find the core of what city officials hope will be Kentucky's answer to the arts and crafts businesses in Nashville in Indiana's Brown County.

While West Point is still a long way from being a tourist attraction of that magnitude, folks are upbeat and they point out that there are four times as many businesses in town as there were only three years ago.

The city of about 1,200 sits on the narrow wedge of land where Hardin County reaches the Ohio River. The population is about half what it was just 30 years ago but West Point has remained self-sustaining.

"We have to be," said Mayor Gene Smith. "We're kinda on an island here; we have to drive through Meade County just to get to our county seat" in Elizabethtown. The city has its own water and sewer systems and operates one of the smallest independent school districts in the state.

Now the city is striving to secure its future by drawing new businesses and trying to become a tourist mecca.

Although a few long-time residents don't like recent changes, others say the city is settling into its new role.

Just a few years ago, however, few people thought the town would amount to anything. Smith, in fact, had worried that increasing expenses and a dwindling tax base would mean an end to one of the state's oldest cities.

Settlers first landed at the confluence of the Ohio and Salt rivers three days before the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Twenty years later, Samuel Pearman and James Young laid out West Point, named because it was the western-most supply post for explorations.

During the Civil War, West Point became a Union outpost when Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman built Fort Duffield on a hill just east of the city. In 1903, the War Department established Camp Young, the forerunner to nearby Fort Knox, in West Point.

Over the years, West Point was ravaged by floods from the Ohio and Salt rivers and after the 1964 flood, there was talk of moving the city to higher ground or building a floodwall. But neither was done and residents say that is one of the best things about West Point: its rich history as a shipping center was left intact.

(The impoundment of the Salt River as Taylorsville Lake in 1983 has helped protect the city from flooding.)

"This is about the only river town left without a floodwall to block the view," said

police Chief Terry Ames. "You can see the river from about anywhere in town."

The trip back for West Point has been a long one. During the 1970s West Point was a haven for transients who got in legal or financial trouble in Jefferson County and needed to move on. They would stop first in West Point until trouble caught up to them, then they would move on again.

"Every couple of years, you'd see the same people come through," Ames said.

During that time, West Pointers, as they call themselves, were looked down upon. Students from West Point who attended high school in Hardin County were referred to as "river rats."

With much of the low-cost rental property gone, Ames said he likes his hometown much better because the new businesses have seemed to give residents more pride.

"It amazes me because I've sat here since I was a kid and watched it go from a really nice town to low income to this," he said.

When Smith took office in 1982, the city had no industry and few businesses. He and other city officials began trying to recruit, but after failing several times, they looked elsewhere.

"We were looking for fast food, big shopping centers, industry, that sort of thing, but it wasn't happening here."

"We're in a vacuum here," he said.

"Then we started thinking, with our history, our geographical location, why couldn't it be a Brown County-type thing?"

City leaders trekked to Brown County to learn how to make the same kind of businesses succeed in West Point. A couple of craft shops and a restaurant or two opened in the early '80s but officials didn't market the town very well and the businesses folded within a year.

Then Carol Goldsmith began talking about the huge potential for tourism to be had in West Point. Goldsmith, who now operates the Ditto House bed and breakfast with her husband, Gaylen, said her confidence made some people think "she don't have her bricks stacked just right."

But an infusion of investors from outside West Point made Goldsmith look prescient.

The community has banded together and is working with the state to rebuild Fort Duffield as it was during the Civil War. The city has also lured steamboats to its banks for limited engagements the past two summers and hopes to land a paddlewheeler on a permanent basis.

But some oldtimers aren't completely sold on tourism or the new state of the city. Kurby Curl, 89, said he and other long-time residents don't like business owners with few ties to West Point "coming in here and telling us how to run our city. . . . They're all good people but we just don't like them telling us what to do."

West Point is trying to navigate some rough waters around City Hall. The attorney general's office has been looking into aspects of city government. The mayor said the investigation centered on budgeting and bidding procedures and that his administration has received a clean bill of health from the attorney general.

"They told us we're fine. . . . As far as I know we're clean as a button," he said last week.

But Ed Lynch, a spokesman for the attorney general, said the investigation is continuing. "We were asked by the city council to investigate some matters concerning city government and that's all I can say," he said.

Lynch would not say what the investigation is about.

One of those trying to look beyond what some say is "petty politics" is Dave Arnce of Meade County. He opened his West Point Antique Mall in 1991 after falling in love with the town, despite the fact that, when he was a soldier at Fort Knox in the 1970s, West Point was little more than a speed trap.

His earliest memories are of trips to the city jail to bail out soldiers being held on traffic charges. He said Judge Gladys Stackhouse "was known all over the United States. Don't go near the hangin' judge," soldiers were warned.

After he retired from the Army, he and his wife bought the old T.C. Williams General Merchandise and Drug store and converted it into their new business.

"You get addicted to this town. Each time a new shop opens, you feel a part of it," he said.

At no time was that more evident on Feb. 20 when the new West Point Country Opry, a 500-seat theater, was dedicated.

Ivan Jennings, who lives in Jefferson County, had operated a similar business in Missouri in the late 1960s and early '70s. On his first trip to West Point after the resurgence began, he told his wife, Edna, "If I ever do another country music show, it will be here."

Before he knew it, Ivan's brother Raymond and his wife, Rita, were moving from near Hannibal, Mo., to help run the business.

The night before their grand opening, the building was far from finished: seats from an old college auditorium weren't yet installed, speakers weren't hooked up and the building was a mess, according to Edna Jennings.

Ivan Jennings said he was sure the Opry would miss its opening until, while installing speakers, he looked out and saw about 40 West Pointers assembling the seats. "They just piled in here and helped out. . . . and they stayed until midnight doing it," he said.

One of those people was Rube Yelvington, who moved his home and part of his tourism business from outside St. Louis after spending a few days in West Point last March.

Yelvington has since started publishing The West Point Voice, which is more a public-relations tool than a traditional newspaper. He prints 12,000 copies each month and distributes them to anyone who will read about his adopted home.

"It was the river, the history and the people" that brought him here, said Yelvington, who is running for mayor this year.

"You can't kick a rock here that something historic doesn't come out from underneath it."

Population (1990): West Point, 1,216; Hardin County, 89,240.

Per-capita income (Hardin County, 1990): \$13,469, or \$1,506 below the state average.

Jobs (Hardin County, 1991): Manufacturing, 4,947; wholesale/retail, 8,047; services, 4,440; state/local government, 4,391; and construction, 1,123.

Media: Newspaper—The West Point Voice, The Radcliff Sentinel, The Elizabethtown News-Enterprise. Louisville radio and television serves the area.

Transportation: Air—Commercial air service available at Louisville's Standiford Field, 28 miles northeast of West Point, Roads—U.S. 31W (Dixie Highway). Rail—Paducah and Louisville Railway.

Education: West Point Independent Schools, 237 students; Hardin County Public Schools, 12,701 students; McKendree College; Elizabethtown Community College.

Topography: River bottom land at the confluence of the Ohio and Salt rivers.

FAMOUS FACTS AND FIGURES

John James Audubon stayed at Young's Inn, on Elm Street, and wrote of his experiences in "The Passenger Pigeon." James Buchanan, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, Wendell Willkie and Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, all stayed at Young's Inn, which is now a private home and apartment building.

Former Louisiana Gov. James A. Noe was West Point's "adopted son," according to a 1959 Courier-Journal story. Noe, who was born in Harrison County, Ind., and lived for a time in Louisville, often visited his sister, Arminda Noe Greer, who ran the West Point Hotel. Noe was one of Huey P. Long's top aides and gave the "Kingfish" blood transfusions after Long was fatally wounded at the Louisiana Capitol.

One of the largest fish ever caught in Kentucky was a 157-pound gar taken from the Salt River at West Point in 1920 by Steve Simpson.

A house at 201 Elm St. was an early prefabricated home ordered from the Sears Roebuck Catalog and assembled in 1899.

Founder James Young owned the city until his death in 1849. Not only did he own the unsold lots, he operated the first ferries, across the Salt and Ohio rivers, Young's Inn and the only restaurant and saloon. His son-in-law owned the stagecoach that served West Point, and Young was instrumental in building the Louisville and Nashville Turnpike, which follows the approximate route of Dixie Highway.

Randy Atcher, star of the old WHAS kiddie show "T-Bar-V," and his brother, Bob, star of the old "Wilson National Barn Dance" radio show, were raised in a house on Elm Street.●

KEVIN MICHAEL BRINK, AAU/MARS MILKY WAY HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN AWARD

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to honor Kevin Michael Brink, a high school senior attending Grandville High School in Grandville, MI. Out of a nationwide pool of 12,000 high school students, Kevin was recently selected as one of eight regional recipients of the AAU/Mars Milky Way High School All-American Award.

This prestigious award honors young men and women for their outstanding academic, athletic, and community service achievements. Throughout his high school years, Kevin has excelled in each of those areas. He is valedictorian of his class, has multiple varsity letters in wrestling and football, and has a dedicated record of service to his community.

Kevin's many accomplishments and fine character were the reasons I nominated him earlier this year for an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, MD.

I am pleased to join Kevin's parents, teachers, friends, and classmates in commending him for his accomplishments and congratulating him for receiving this well-deserved award.●

NORTH AMERICAN COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, on Wednesday, March 17, I spoke on the

North American Commission on the Environment negotiations that began on that day, and which will supplement the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I asked that a statement by Senator CHAFEE be printed after my statement—however it was not. I now ask unanimous consent that Senator CHAFEE's statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN H. CHAFEE

Ambassador Kantor, it is a pleasure to have you testify before our Committee on the proposed environmental side agreement to the NAFTA.

Frankly, it is curious that there is such a hullabaloo about the environmental aspects of this Agreement. No one raised environmental questions when we did our free trade agreements with Canada, or with Israel. Yet suddenly complaints are heard that this Agreement, which is far "greener" than any previous Agreement, is not green enough. This is claimed because unlike Canada and Israel, Mexico is a developing nation. But developed nations frequently are more environmentally unsound with their esoteric and dangerous chemicals, than are developing nations.

From the very onset of these NAFTA negotiations, the environment has been a key factor. Throughout the NAFTA discussions, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) participated actively, releasing a Review of U.S.-Mexico Environmental Issues, and formulating the Border Plan. Moreover, EPA officials actually sat at the negotiating table, as members of nine USTR negotiating teams.

Environmental organizations also contributed, serving in a formal advisory capacity. They served on five of the eight senior-level Trade Policy Advisory Committees, which advise the President on negotiating objectives and bargaining positions.

In perhaps the most impressive indication that environmental considerations in trade policy are here to stay, last year a new position was created at USTR: "Deputy Assistant US Trade Representative for Environmental Affairs."

But having achieved such remarkable steps for the environment, it now seems that these accomplishments are taken for granted or dismissed outright, and now are considered merely the starting point from which we begin anew today.

For example, recently Senator Riegle sent you a letter, signed by 25 senators, expressing the statement that "the NAFTA, as it currently stands, fails to serve American interests in *** environmental protection." But when one looks at the signatories, this dire warning hardly comes as a surprise. Of the 25 senators, 23 were here during the 1991 fast track debate—and all but 5 of those senators voted against fast track, passage of which was essential for this Agreement.

Thus, most of these are senators who are, and always have been, flat-out opposed to the NAFTA. Some will grab any handy rationale—including becoming born-again environmentalists—to defeat it, or at least slow it down until it dies a painful, lingering death.

Mr. Ambassador, no matter what environmental side agreements you make, you will not satisfy most of these senators. There are more of them than there are of you, and they can keep you working night and day with more and more demands. I advise you to save your strength and instead to simply do what

you think is right and do it quickly, no matter what criticism from that quarter is hurled your way. 25 senators may have signed that letter, but 75 senators did not.

The Mexicans have made it clear that they will not accept proposals that infringe on their national sovereignty or that are inconsistent with the objectives of the Agreement—two principles that we can hardly object to. After all, as you said last week, Mr. Ambassador, what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander.

The strength of environmental advocacy lies in the credibility of its proponents. If those of us who consider ourselves environmentalists wish to be taken seriously by others, we must not squander our precious credibility by continuously and loudly pressing for the impossible or the impractical. Yes, the perfect is the enemy of the good.

As the Washington Post said yesterday: "NAFTA is the best and only hope of [environmental perfectionists] for better enforcement of the air and water rules in Mexico. If they defeat it in Congress, they will have sacrificed their only lever for better cooperation."

On a recent trip to Mexico I found, as in most countries struggling with rapid development, pollution. But I also found determined efforts to relieve and resolve environmental problems. The task is monumental; but the commitment to making progress, genuine.

Mexicans are not doing this to please a few U.S. senators who complain loudly and condescendingly about Mexico's pollution, but are doing this for the well-being of their own citizenry, who increasingly are talking "green" and voting Green.

The best way to ensure that Mexico's environment is cleaned up is to help Mexico become a prosperous country; and that means the NAFTA. If we overburden the Agreement, and allow it to slip away, we will have passed up a chance to boost our own economic and environmental fortunes, and we also will have missed an opportunity to make a major contribution to long-term economic growth and stability in this hemisphere.

It has been said "there is a tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune." What a disservice we would make to prevent and future generations if we missed that tide.●

FACES OF THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my effort to put a face on the health care crisis confronting America. The high cost of health care is having a devastating impact on businesses and retirees. We have all read and heard stories about retirees who have lost their health benefits or a company that has had to cut its retiree health benefits. I continue to hear from hundreds of retirees in my State of Michigan who have had their benefits substantially reduced or even eliminated. Douglas and Gail Slack of Traverse City, MI, are senior citizens whose retiree benefits have been cut. The Slacks wrote to me in February 1993 to tell me about their situation.

After spending 37 years at Burroughs—which later became Unisys—as a computer repairperson, Douglas

Slack, now 55 years old, had earned the full medical benefits that Unisys offered. In May 1992, Douglas was laid off by Unisys, forcing him into an early retirement. Last fall the Slacks received a letter from the company informing them that their employer's contribution to their health care coverage would be phased out at the end of 3 years and their monthly contribution increased. Unisys would still offer health care benefits to all retirees, but at a much higher price. In 1993, their monthly contribution is \$50. In 1994, it is estimated that the Slacks will have to pay in about \$200 per month, and in 1995, they will have to pay at least \$460 a month. That is quite a large sum for people who are living on a fixed retirement income of \$690 a month. This high increase in the cost of health benefits will force the Slacks to make tough decisions in their life. Their income will barely be enough to pay their bills much less pay for health care. Douglas and Gail will not qualify for Medicare until they reach the age of 65 years. The Slacks are caught in a catch-22.

Douglas' wife Gail, age 54, has had an ongoing infection since 1987 and requires three different types of daily medications to fight off infection and reduce pain. With this condition, no other medical plan will carry them, so they are forced to depend on the medical plan offered by Unisys.

Unfortunately, the Slacks situation is not uncommon. According to a recent study by A. Foster Higgins, two-thirds of all companies plan to reduce retiree health benefits or shift more of the cost into the retirees; 6 percent have, or plan to, cut retiree benefits completely.

Skyrocketing health care costs are a back-breaking burden on some businesses and have affected their ability to compete domestically and internationally. The central problem is we do not have a level playing field for many U.S. businesses who, unlike their

competitors, carry these retiree health costs. This is particularly burdensome in sectors where workers retire several years prior to Medicare eligibility.

High retiree health costs are a major destabilizing factor in certain key manufacturing industries in this country, including auto parts, heavy trucks, steel, telecommunications, and agricultural implements.

In the auto industry, there is a \$600-per-vehicle cost differential between the Japanese transplants and the big 3 domestic manufacturers due solely to health care costs. Retiree health costs are a major reason for this competitive disadvantage—accounting for more than \$350 per vehicle or about one-third of the total health care cost per vehicle.

Companies that volunteer to provide coverage to retirees are in fact relieving the burden on the public sector, but high costs are making it impossible for many companies to continue offering benefits. Reducing their health care costs in this area would increase their competitiveness and help revitalize the manufacturing sector.

Health care costs continue to be a burden on businesses that have been offering health care benefits, in particular, those in the manufacturing sector. Costs are difficult to control and these businesses have in fact been subsidizing health care costs for others, including many small businesses who do not offer benefits. This occurs because companies that provide health insurance are having to pay more to cover the costs of uncompensated care—a practice known as cost-shifting. That is why any health care reform proposal must address the competitive inequities facing companies with high retiree health care costs.

For the Slacks, the increasing cost of medical benefits means that Douglas will have to take a minimum wage job now in order to cover the price of health care. The loss of insurance cov-

erage for retirees is another sign that our Nation's health care system must be reformed. I will continue to do all that I can to make sure that the Slacks and all other retired Americans have access to high quality affordable health care. •

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1993

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m., Monday, March 22; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate then resume consideration of Calendar No. 34, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, the concurrent budget resolution; that with respect to any votes ordered to occur relative to amendments offered during Monday's session, that these votes occur not prior to the votes previously ordered to occur on Tuesday, March 23; that the Senate resume consideration of the DeConcini amendment No. 185 on Tuesday, March 23 at 2:15 p.m., with the vote on or in relation to the amendment occurring at 2:25 p.m. on Tuesday, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1993, AT 9 A.M.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:07 p.m., recessed until Monday, March 22, 1993, at 9 a.m.